



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2014

No. 140

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

November 17, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable VIRGINIA FOXX to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

FUNDING ALZHEIMER'S RESEARCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VELA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge the inclusion of additional funding for Alzheimer's research in the National Institutes of Health's budget. This disease affects over 5 million Americans, and every 67 seconds, someone develops Alzheimer's.

The impact on these patients and their families is immense, and Congress must act now to ensure needed funding is available to researchers willing to understand, treat, and cure Alzheimer's.

As the Appropriations Committee drafts spending legislation for the current fiscal year, it is critical that the NIH budget include an initial \$200 million for Alzheimer's research. The requirement for this funding was validated by the National Alzheimer's Plan, a comprehensive congressionally-directed initiative which serves as a blueprint to ensure that taxpayer dollars are carefully invested in medical research.

One in three seniors who die each year have been diagnosed with Alzheimer's or dementia, and the Centers for Disease Control notes that it is the sixth leading cause of death in the United States.

In addition to the terrible toll on individuals, the costs of treating Alzheimer's will cost over \$214 billion this year. With so much at stake, an investment of \$200 million in 2015 is clearly justified, and we must also continue to provide funding for Alzheimer's research in future years.

On behalf of south Texas families affected by Alzheimer's, I urge my colleagues in Congress to support increased funding for Alzheimer's research.

TERRORIST POACHING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, the call of the wild from mammoth African elephants and rhinos has grown meek and blissfully silent.

The culprit: outlaw terrorists who are tracking and hunting down these massive creatures to fund their filthy, lucre terrorist enterprises. Our enemy is sophisticated and well-funded, but their weapons, surveillance equipment and training, food, lodging, and travel cost a lot of money.

ISIS has a terrorist army that has raised billions of dollars through extor-

tion, drugs, bank robbery, kidnapping, and oil smuggling, but there is one source of funding for terrorism that is being overlooked: poaching.

Madam Speaker, the illegal wildlife trade in Africa is a \$7 to \$10 billion a year business. According to the non-partisan Congressional Research Service, a rhino horn sells for \$65,000 a kilogram in Asia. That is more expensive than silver, gold, diamonds, or illicit drugs.

The number one buyer of ivory is none other than China. With big profits and high demand, poaching has risen dramatically.

Madam Speaker, two-thirds of central Africa's forest elephants have been wiped out in the last 10 years. 100,000 elephants were killed in Africa between 2010 and 2012. In just those 10 years, central Africa has lost 64 percent of its elephants, according to National Geographic.

One of those elephants killed was Satao, pictured right here before he was killed. Satao was called by some as the world's biggest and largest elephant. Satao had tusks that reached to the ground, as you can see, but last June, he was found in a swamp, dead, killed for his tusks. He was 45 to 46 years old. The poachers finally got this old bull.

Terrorists have identified this lucrative industry of systematically killing African animals as another source of cash to fund their murderous enterprises. The al Qaeda affiliate al Shabaab generated between \$200,000 and \$600,000 a month from just tusks, according to the African Elephant Action League. The blood money accounted for as much as 40 percent of al Shabaab's total operating budget.

These terrorist poachers not only kill African animals, but they kill the wildlife wardens guarding them as well.

Other terrorist organizations implicated in the illegal poaching trade include Joseph Kony's Lord's Resistance

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H7999

Army in central Africa and Boko Haram in Nigeria.

Unsurprisingly, these terrorists have also taken advantage of the instability and corruption in African governments. Terrorists sell their bounties under the radar in the illicit market. The penalties for those caught poaching are minimal.

So for terrorists who are looking to avoid detection, make a lot of money, and not face consequences if caught, poaching is their grand bargain.

So what is being done? Our intelligence community has yet to establish a clear understanding of which terrorist groups are the most involved in poaching and who facilitates the worldwide transactions from Africa to other countries.

We need wildlife trackers to track the money trail and the destruction of these creatures. The administration needs to have a plan to stop this eradication of mammoth animals.

Multiple agencies from the State Department, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and others have been involved in efforts to eradicate poaching, but it appears no agency has taken the lead. Talk must turn to action.

Last February, the Presidential Task Force on Wildlife Trafficking issued a national strategy for combating wildlife trafficking, but there is no implementation plan. Nine months later, we are still waiting for a strategy to go into effect.

Meanwhile, endangered species are being slaughtered, like Satao, and terrorists are being paid from the sales of endangered species' tusks and horns.

Preserving endangered species is a noble goal, but the fact that killers worldwide are using this money to fund terrorism makes it even more urgent we stop this ruthless criminal conduct.

These terrorists kill animals, so they can get money to kill people. The combination of these two evils, the killing of endangered species and innocent civilians to further radical terrorism, is an international threat.

The world cannot allow radical Islamic terrorists to continue the wholesale slaughter of rhinos and elephants to fund their reign of terror. Make terrorists extinct, not these animals. Otherwise, the only rhinos and elephants our grandkids are going to see are the stuffed animals at Toys "R" Us.

And that is just the way it is.

NATIONAL CARE CORPS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Madam Speaker, I rise during National Family Caregivers Month to recognize the millions of family caregivers who do incredible work every day and to talk about the future of caregiving in this country.

Right now, the vast majority of care services in the United States are pro-

vided by family caregivers. They do this out of love for their loved ones, to restore and maintain respect and dignity, and because the vast majority of disabled adults and seniors rely on Medicare as their primary insurance, and Medicare does not pay for long-term care services, and they are barely ineligible for Medicaid, which might.

Forty-nine million Americans provide more than 520 billion in care to seniors and adults with disabilities every year. They manage a range of really difficult responsibilities because they have a friend or a loved one who is older or who has a disability and is in need of extra help.

I know how tough it is to be a family caregiver because I am one. My mother, who lives with me in New Mexico, relies on me to oversee her care and also provide financial support. These are difficult arrangements for a number of reasons. Having a parent rely on a child when they have spent their life being the caregiver can be a tough transition to make.

But family caregivers navigate that relationship while taking the time to call insurance companies and hospitals to ensure their loved one is getting proper care and while often having to use their own resources to cover many of the costs associated with that care.

They do it out of love, and they do it because they know that their mother or their husband or their friend wants to remain as independent as possible, and they know that they want to live out their lives with dignity. I think they have earned that right.

But these family caregivers cannot do it alone. They need someone to take their sister to her appointment and when they get busy with a day at work or to make sure that their dad takes his medication while they attend a parent-teacher conference.

Already in this country, we have got more than 4 million men and women who have chosen direct care as a career and provide these kind of services on a paid basis, but if you look at the sheer demographics, that is not nearly enough.

As the baby boom generation continues to age, demand for services will increase. The gap between the number of family caregivers and direct care workers and the number of people who need services will continue to grow.

In 2010, there were seven potential caregivers for every person over the age of 80. By 2030, that ratio is projected to drop by almost half, to 4.1.

In the direct care workforce, demand is projected to grow, so that the U.S. will need to add at least 1 million more direct care workers over the next 10 years.

So we face real challenges in growing a workforce that will help meet the needs of our population. At the same time, our economy continues to slowly recover from the Great Recession.

Young people looking to enter the workforce, along with workers who are willing to retrain, want to find jobs in

a field that is growing and can provide them with some job security.

So I see two challenges that I think can be solved with one coordinated national effort called Care Corps. My bill, H.R. 5288, creates a national Care Corps that will place volunteers and communities to work with seniors and individuals with disabilities who need a little extra support to live independently.

In return for their services, volunteers will receive health insurance and other benefits, along with a postservice educational award. This award can be used to pay for up to 2 years of attendance at an institution of higher education or to pay back educational loans.

But I want to end with what I think will be the program's legacy if we are able to get this done. Care Corps provides an opportunity for intergenerational relationships, for seniors and our young people to learn from each other, and for us as a country to gain a better sense of our history to the people that lived it.

Anyone who has ever been a caregiver will tell you not just that it was challenging, but that it was incredibly rewarding.

So I want to thank our family caregivers who are already filling a serious void in this country, and I want to urge my colleagues to support them by supporting the National Care Corps Act.

RECOGNIZING LETTER CARRIER MARGARET HUTCHENS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize Yadkinville Letter Carrier Margaret Hutchens, who delivers mail in the Country Club Road area, the Booneville end of U.S. 601, and the Hamptonville side of Old U.S. 421 West, upon her induction into the prestigious Million Mile Club.

Margaret received this high honor from the National Safety Council in recognition of having driven in the workplace for at least 30 years or 1 million miles without incurring a preventable motor vehicle accident.

Let's think about the magnitude of travelling 1 million miles. That would be two trips to the moon and back.

At the celebration honoring her accomplishment, Margaret thanked the customers on her route and said she knew God was looking out for her during those 30 years of accident-free driving.

This honor illustrates the dedication to excellence that Margaret practices every day, and her customers are fortunate to have such a reliable and hard-working letter carrier.

□ 1215

WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES RULE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Friday, November 14, was the closing of the public comment period for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' proposed "waters of the United States"—WOTUS, as it is known—rule under the Clean Water Act, which would dramatically expand the scope of Federal authority over water and land uses across the United States.

Enacted in 1972, the Clean Water Act was created as a partnership between the States and the Federal EPA in order to better manage identified pollution sources through a range of pollution control programs.

This new proposed rule is a direct threat to this longstanding federalist approach created by the law, which has been long supported by Republicans and Democrats alike for over four decades.

It is through this federalist model, which enables regulators at the Federal, State, and local levels to provide adequate flexibility to address water quality while accounting for local and regional variations and conditions, that Pennsylvania has demonstrated a track record of success in improving and protecting the ecological health of its waters. Unfortunately, the proposed rule would dramatically expand the Federal authority to the detriment of our economy and at the expense of existing State-Federal partnerships that have been effective in protecting and improving the biological integrity of our watersheds and waterways.

For this reason, I along with Senator PAT TOOMEY and eight additional members of the Pennsylvania delegation in the U.S. House of Representatives voiced our strong opposition to this flawed policy. In comments submitted Friday to the agencies, we outlined concerns specific to our home State and those of our constituents, including private landowners, counties, municipalities, farmers, foresters, among so many who will be negatively impacted if this rule is allowed to be fully implemented.

Mr. Speaker, there is a widespread agreement that the Clean Water Act has been a beneficial tool for the management and the health of our Nation's watersheds and water quality.

While Congressional intent of the Clean Water Act has been limited to "navigable waters," the extent of the law's jurisdiction has been the subject of much litigation and regulatory action. Complicating the issue further are Supreme Court decisions that have not adequately described the scope of Federal authority under the law resulting, at times, in conflict.

While the existing law and the Supreme Court have left uncertainty regarding what constitutes a "water of the United States," previous holdings have made clear that the Federal Government's authority is not limitless.

Unfortunately, the proposed rule assumes just that—limitless Federal authority.

Mr. Speaker, the reason this is so concerning is that many of these issues are best regulated at the State level in a manner that recognizes regional differences in geography, climate, geology, soils, hydrology, and rainfall, among other variables. Rather than strengthen the law, the rule creates more confusion—confusion that will most certainly delay permitting and will undermine strong water quality programs that exist in Pennsylvania and in other States. Moreover, this type of uncertainty is susceptible to inconsistent interpretation and application, which holds the potential for substantial implementation costs across the various Clean Water Act programs, and will likely invite more enforcement actions and third-party litigation.

In addition to jeopardizing existing water quality control programs, the economic impact of the proposed rule will be far-reaching. Activities that drive economic development in Pennsylvania, such as highway and road construction, pipeline projects, energy production, infrastructure projects, farming, flood control, and public works projects will all be subject to Federal permitting if this proposal is finalized.

For example, the rule would make most ditches into tributaries. Routine maintenance activities in ditches and on-site ponds and impoundments could trigger permits that can cost \$100,000 or more. These permitting requirements would likely trigger additional environmental reviews which would add years to the completion time for ordinary projects, which means more costs for landowners and more regulatory burdens upon the States, all with no guarantee or measurable benefits to our waters.

Mr. Speaker, we all agree that managing the Nation's water is critically important, but in this case, the Federal Government has failed to recognize the fundamental role that States play in meeting our shared goals of clean watersheds and water resources. Mr. Speaker, it is time for EPA and the Corps to vacate this proposal, get back to the drawing board, and fix the fundamental flaws within this rule. The American people, including my constituents in Pennsylvania, deserve as much.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JOLLY) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Dear God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We ask Your special blessing upon the Members of this people's House. They face difficult decisions in difficult times with many forces and interests demanding their attention.

We are grateful, O God, that You have given to them the goals of justice and the designs of freedom. Remind each Member that it is their work to develop the strategies and plans of achieving those goals and designs being mindful of the prompting of Your spirit.

You have given to each of them and to us all the abilities to do good works, so we pray that we will be faithful in our tasks, responsible in our actions, and fervent in our desire to serve.

Bless us all, O God, this day and every day to come. And may all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of North Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

HONORING RICHARD FISHER

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the work of Richard Fisher, who will be retiring as the president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas this coming spring.

President Fisher's work at the institution for the past 10 years has served our area well. Richard has been a fearless advocate for the low regulation of the Texas economy. Because of his stance, north Texas has experienced tremendous economic growth and vitality during the time of his presidency.

I feel privileged to have known and worked closely with President Fisher during the time he and I worked together on economic development summits in southeast Fort Worth. Those were a huge success and were helpful to the small businesses that were in an economically challenged area. He was always available and helpful to me personally. His stances on preventing banks that are too big to fail from coming to the taxpayer for bailouts was inspiring.

On behalf of the 26th District of Texas, I commend President Richard Fisher on a job well done. I congratulate him on his retirement and wish him every success in the future.

PRESIDENT DECEIVED AMERICANS ABOUT OBAMACARE

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's Charleston Post and Courier, Charles Krauthammer points out the President's deceit when misrepresenting ObamaCare before shoving it through a Democratic Congress.

According to the column, an "October 2013 video has surfaced that shows MIT Professor Jonathan Gruber, a principal architect of ObamaCare, admitting that, in order to get it passed, the law was made deliberately obscure and deceptive. It constitutes the ultimate vindication of the charge that ObamaCare was sold on a pack of lies."

As more is revealed about the truth behind the President's manipulation when passing ObamaCare, "It's refreshing that 'the most transparent administration in history' . . . should finally display candor about its signature act of social change. Inadvertently, of course. But now we know what lay behind Obama's smooth . . . arrogance . . . that rules in the name of the citizenry it mocks, disdains, and deliberately, contemptuously deceives."

It is sad Democratic elitists believe their voters are stupid.

In conclusion, God bless our troops. The President should take action to never forget September the 11th and the global war on terrorism.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair must remind all Members that remarks in debate may not engage in personalities toward the President.

MIZZOU 175TH BIRTHDAY

(Mrs. HARTZLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize my alma mater, the University of Missouri, as it celebrates 175 years of providing quality education, cutting-edge research, and practical extension services to all Missourians.

Mizzou was the first State university established west of the Mississippi and

is a school rich with tradition. I am humbled to be a graduate of such a longstanding, esteemed institution.

The University of Missouri was home to the first journalism school in the world and is still recognized as one of the best schools around the world for agriculture, business, and journalism, just to name a few.

The core values of the University of Missouri—respect, responsibility, discovery, and excellence—leave a mark on every individual influenced by this institution and have helped shape me as an American citizen and lawmaker.

Throughout my career in education and public service, I have striven to uphold the values of the university and sleep well knowing that all alumni, present and future, will do the same.

I am so proud to be a Tiger, and I wish a very happy birthday to Mizzou. Go Tigers!

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

FEDERAL DUCK STAMP ACT OF 2014

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5069) to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act to increase in the price of Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamps to fund the acquisition of conservation easements for migratory birds, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5069

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Federal Duck Stamp Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. INCREASE IN PRICE OF MIGRATORY BIRD HUNTING AND CONSERVATION STAMP TO FUND ACQUISITION OF CONSERVATION EASEMENTS FOR MIGRATORY BIRDS.

The Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act is amended—

(1) in section 2(b) (16 U.S.C. 718b(b))—

(A) by striking "1990, and" and inserting "1990,"; and

(B) by striking "for each hunting year thereafter" and inserting "for hunting years 1991 through 2013, and \$25 for each hunting year thereafter";

(2) by adding at the end of section 2 (16 U.S.C. 718b) the following:

"(C) REDUCTION IN PRICE OF STAMP.—The Secretary may reduce the price of each stamp sold under the provisions of this section for a hunting year if the Secretary determines that the in-

crease in the price of the stamp after hunting year 2013 resulted in a reduction in revenues deposited into the fund."; and

(3) in section 4 (16 U.S.C. 718d)—

(A) in subsection (a)(3), by inserting before the period the following: "in which there shall be a subaccount to which the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer all amounts in excess of \$15 that are received from the sale of each stamp sold for each hunting year after hunting year 2013";

(B) in subsection (b)(1), by striking "So much" and inserting "Except as provided in paragraph (4), so much";

(C) in subsection (b)(2), by striking "paragraph (3)" and inserting "paragraphs (3) and (4)"; and

(D) by adding at the end of subsection (b) the following:

"(4) CONSERVATION EASEMENTS.—Amounts in the subaccount referred to in subsection (a)(3) shall be used by the Secretary solely to acquire easements in real property in the United States for conservation of migratory birds."

SEC. 3. ANNUAL REPORT ON EXPENDITURES.

Section 4 of the Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act (16 U.S.C. 718d) is further amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking so much as precedes "The Secretary may" and inserting the following:

"(c) PROMOTION OF STAMP SALES.—"; and

(B) by striking paragraph (2); and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(d) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Secretary shall include in each annual report of the Commission under section 3 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 715b)—

"(1) a description of activities conducted under subsection (c) in the year covered by the report;

"(2) an annual assessment of the status of wetlands conservation projects for migratory bird conservation purposes, including a clear and accurate accounting of—

"(A) all expenditures by Federal and State agencies under this section; and

"(B) all expenditures made for fee-simple acquisition of Federal lands in the United States, including the amount paid and acreage of each parcel acquired in each acquisition;

"(3) an analysis of the refuge lands opened, and refuge lands closed, for hunting and fishing in the year covered by the report, including—

"(A) identification of the specific areas in each refuge and the reasons for the closure or opening; and

"(B) a detailed description of each closure including detailed justification for such closure;

"(4) the total number of acres of refuge land open for hunting and fishing, and the total number of acres of refuge land closed for hunting and fishing, in the year covered by the report; and

"(5) a separate report on the hunting and fishing status of those lands added to the system in the year covered by the report."

SEC. 4. EXEMPTION FOR TAKINGS BY RURAL ALASKA SUBSISTENCE USERS.

Section 1(a)(2) of the Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act (16 U.S.C. 718a(a)(2)) is amended by striking "or" after the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting "or", and by adding at the end the following:

"(D) by a rural Alaska resident for subsistence uses (as that term is defined in section 803 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3113))."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As author of H.R. 5069, I am pleased that we are considering this bipartisan bill that has been cosponsored by the dean of the House of Representatives, the leadership of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus, and the entire Louisiana House congressional delegation.

The Federal Duck Stamp Act will modestly increase the price of the Federal duck stamp for the first time in 23 years and, by so doing, restore the buying power of this conservation tool which has been used to acquire, conserve, lease, and restore thousands of acres of wetlands.

Wetlands are critical to the survival of not only migratory waterfowl but to the millions of Americans who live along our coastlines. The U.S. Geological Survey has calculated that for every 2.5 miles a hurricane travels across wetlands, the storm surge is reduced by 1 foot. It is therefore likely that wetlands were directly responsible for saving lives and property in the gulf coast that were devastated by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

This legislation has been endorsed by Ducks Unlimited and more than 30 national conservation organizations, including the National Rifle Association, Boone and Crockett Club, the National Wild Turkey Federation, and the Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation.

In their support letter, these groups noted that, "In order for us to pass down our hunting heritage from generation to generation, sustain a vital and viable resource for wildlife and people, we must increase the price of the duck stamp this year."

I urge adoption of H.R. 5069, and I want to thank all of the Members who join with me in this effort.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5069 would authorize an increase in the price of the Federal duck stamp from \$15 to \$25. Duck stamp revenue funds the purchase and conservation of wetland habitats critical to maintaining waterfowl populations and other wildlife prized by hunters. This increase will restore the purchasing power of the duck stamp dollars to nearly 1991 levels, the last time Congress increased the price of the duck stamp.

The current price of the stamp is \$15, which equates to less than \$9 in 1991. The increase is expected to generate \$5 million in revenue for securing con-

servation easements on land in the United States.

While I take issue with some of the requirements and restrictions this bill would place on the Fish and Wildlife Service, the opportunity to generate these additional funds for wetland conservation with the support of hunters and other nature lovers is one that we must take advantage of.

I support the passage of the bill and congratulate the author of the legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say in closing that not only do we have huge bipartisan support for this bill, but I just want to point out, as an example, in 2012, we spent, essentially, an equal amount of money on both the fee simple land purchase and the easement. Around \$16- to \$17 million each. But look at the bang for the buck we got. We purchased 14,747 acres fee simple, but on easements we got 48,144.

So it is obvious that not only is this a huge savings to the taxpayer, this is a much better deal, but also think about the maintenance costs that are now going to be unnecessary because landowners with the easements will continue to maintain the land rather than taxpayers.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today, my colleagues and I will vote on the Federal Duck Stamp Act of 2014. This bill would raise the price of Federal Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamps (more commonly known as "Duck Stamps"), for the first time in 23 years, from \$15 to \$25. I am a proud supporter of this legislation and ask my colleagues to vote in favor.

Ever since Congress created the Duck Stamp program in 1934, hunters have bought duck stamps to help pay for the protection of wildlife habitats. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service uses the money generated from these sales to acquire new land or preserve existing wildlife refuges for water fowl. Duck Stamps also serve as an entrance pass for any national wildlife refuge that charges admission, so they are in effect a user fee for hunters and bird watchers.

Today, because of rising land prices and inflation in general, the value of the Duck Stamp has fallen by 40 percent, depriving conservation efforts of crucial funds. As an avid hunter, I understand the importance of investing in our wildlife habitats. We need to pass these traditions on to the next generation, so they can learn the importance of being good stewards of the land.

Since the federal government already owns nearly one third of our country's land, this bill prohibits new land acquisition and requires the funds generated from the fee increase to be used solely for acquiring easements for migratory birds. But since the funds collected from Duck Stamp sales are technically classified as revenues, increasing the fees to allow for higher spending on protecting migratory-bird habitats does not comply with the House's "Cut as You Go" rule (Rule XXI, Clause 10).

In the past, we've made exceptions for spending increases that are offset with rev-

enue increases for selected programs when there is a close connection between the revenues and the spending. For example, budget resolutions often include reserve funds that effectively waive the "Cut as You Go" rule for deficit-neutral legislation designed to achieve a specific purpose.

Because the funds generated from this legislation will be user fees, not taxes, and this bill reduces the deficit, I support granting a waiver of the "Cut as You Go" rule for consideration of this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5069, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVING A USE RESTRICTION TO CERTAIN LAND IN ROCKINGHAM COUNTY, VIRGINIA

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5162) to amend the Act entitled "An Act to allow a certain parcel of land in Rockingham County, Virginia, to be used for a child care center" to remove the use restriction, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5162

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REMOVAL OF USE RESTRICTION.

The Act entitled "An Act to allow a certain parcel of land in Rockingham County, Virginia, to be used for a child care center", approved October 31, 1990 (Public Law 101-479), is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. REMOVAL OF USE RESTRICTION.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any restrictions in the deed, on and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the parcel comprised of approximately 3.03 acres of land transferred by the United States on April 11, 1989, to the county of Rockingham, Virginia, in deed book number 953 at page 600, together with improvements thereon may be used by the county as if the land had been transferred in fee simple with no use or other restrictions.

"(b) DOCUMENTATION.—As soon as practical after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall take such actions as are necessary to issue a fee simple deed with no restrictions to the land described in subsection (a) to the county of Rockingham, Virginia."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include

extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In 1989, the Department of the Interior deeded a small parcel of land to Rockingham County, Virginia, for public purpose. This land includes a garage that had previously been used by the National Park Service.

The County determined a nonprofit childcare center in Broadway, Virginia, would benefit from the use of the garage, and Public Law 101-479 allowed the deed to be changed for the particular use of the childcare center. However, under the terms and restrictions of the transfer, the nonprofit is unable to obtain financing to make improvements and renovations to the property. H.R. 5162 would remove the restrictions on the land so the necessary upgrades may be made to the childcare center.

Congressman GOODLATTE has offered a commonsense bill that will assist the constituents and the community. I urge support for the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1415

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 5162 removes the use restriction on a 3-acre parcel of Federal land granted in 1990 to Rockingham County, Virginia. The county no longer needs the parcel for child care and seeks to develop it for other purposes.

The 3-acre parcel was given to Rockingham County through the National Park Service's Federal Lands to Parks Program. The Federal Lands to Parks Program provides Federal land to counties and to other State and local entities to develop community parks and public spaces. If land granted through this program is no longer needed for its original purpose, the National Park Service has the administrative authority to sell the land at fair market value.

This involves what could be a very lengthy valuation process, but it is important to remember that these assets are owned by the American taxpayers, held in trust by the Federal Government, and they deserve a fair return. In this case, to the best of my knowledge, Rockingham County did not approach the National Park Service to discuss purchasing the land at fair market value. Instead, the county went straight to Congress for this legislative fix.

Revisionary clauses and land use restrictions exist to ensure the fair use of Federal land and a fair return to the American taxpayer. Of course, it is important to look at these on a case-by-case basis, recognizing when Congress should chime in and when it is more appropriate for administrative action. Congress should only get involved when all other options are exhausted.

While there may have been an alternative method to achieving the objective of this legislation, we support the adoption of H.R. 5162.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

(Mr. GOODLATTE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for yielding the time and the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, Mr. HASTINGS, for moving this legislation forward. I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona as well for his support and indicate to him that the intention is to continue to use this land for a child care center, but in order to improve the child care center, they need to be able to get financing that is not available with the encumbrance that exists right now.

Mr. Speaker, for over 25 years, a little over 3 acres of land and its associated buildings, previously wholly held by the Federal Government, have been maintained by Rockingham County and the Plains Area Daycare Center in my congressional district.

In 1989, the Federal Government deeded these 3 acres of land to Rockingham County, but prior to this official declaration, Rockingham County had already been maintaining the lands around the facility. The land and building had been used as a garage and maintenance facility for the National Forest Service. However, it was no longer being utilized, and the county was doing upkeep on the land.

The land transfer in 1989 allowed this land to be used for public purposes. The county decided that the nonprofit Plains Area Daycare Center in Broadway, Virginia, which provides child care on a sliding scale and helps many families who otherwise could not afford child care, would benefit from the use of the old garage. Public Law 101-479 allowed the deed to be changed from public use for the particular use of the child care center.

Donations by the community, totaling \$75,000, turned the garage building into a nursery, daycare, and after-school care facility. Additionally, the creation of the daycare center provided for the creation of a playground that the center supports and is open for public use. To be clear, the center and the playground are the sole reason that this previously abandoned government land is being used by the community.

Unfortunately, because of the narrow way Public Law 101-479 was drafted, any extension or maintenance of the physical structures has required approval by the Department of the Interior. In 1998, the county had to obtain permission from the Department to add an addition that was funded through pledges and a county loan, resulting in another \$125,000 worth of improvements by the community.

The building is, once again, in need of repairs, forcing the county to seek approval from the Department of the Interior for repairs. Further, because of the terms of the deed, the daycare center has been unable to get a loan to complete the needed renovations.

I have been pleased to visit the Plains Area Daycare Center on many occasions. The center is committed to providing high-quality child care on a sliding scale. The center is also committed to making sure children have the skills necessary to enter and thrive in school through early childhood education programs. The investments this center is making in the community are immeasurable. Since opening in 1991, the center has always been at capacity, and it is the only facility of its kind in the community. By passing this legislation and allowing Rockingham County and, in return, the Plains Area Daycare Center more authority over the land, it will ensure that more children and more of the community will be served by this land.

Mr. Speaker, my legislation today is a simple formality. For 25 years, the land has been deeded to Rockingham County but with restriction. It is clear the Federal Government no longer has a vested interest in the land. This property is being used by the county and the community to help those in need. My legislation removes the restrictions on the land to ensure this community investment can continue to thrive.

I urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 5162 so that the necessary upgrades may be made to the child care center and so that the community can be better served.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, if I may inquire of the gentleman from Louisiana if he has any more speakers.

Mr. FLEMING. We have no further speakers.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5162.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

CAMP PENDLETON MEDAL OF HONOR POST OFFICE

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5468) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1103 USPS Building 1103 in Camp Pendleton, California, as the

"Camp Pendleton Medal of Honor Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5468

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CAMP PENDLETON MEDAL OF HONOR POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1103 USPS Building 1103 in Camp Pendleton, California, shall be known and designated as the "Camp Pendleton Medal of Honor Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Camp Pendleton Medal of Honor Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) and the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, of the several postal namings that we are voting on today, almost all of them are honoring members of the military and, disproportionately, members who have given their lives in service to their country, and it is fitting that we should do that. However, H.R. 5468 seeks something very different.

Currently called the "Mainside" Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton Post Office, it is not named for anyone. Camp Pendleton has produced more Medal of Honor recipients—most of them posthumously—through World War II, Korea, Vietnam, and the various gulf wars. Even as we speak today, marines are engaged now in Iraq again, having completed their missions in Afghanistan, and, undoubtedly, the valor they show will someday result in additional Medal of Honor recipients.

It is impossible to name the post office at Camp Pendleton after one marine, no matter how great, or after a few marines, even if they died together in battle—therefore, the unusual naming here at Camp Pendleton, a base that opened in 1942 and that, today, is the largest base of marines anywhere in the world. Over 42,000 marines and corpsmen call Camp Pendleton their home when they are not away from home.

I am humbled and honored to be able to represent Camp Pendleton for my entire nearly 14 years of service in the Congress. As a former Army officer, I have learned a great deal about ma-

rines. I have learned even more about their valor. Only in a place like Camp Pendleton would you find that the base band is named after a band leader who earned a Medal of Honor during the Korean conflict as he, in fact, laid covering fire for his fellow marines from a burning tank.

Therefore, today, we are considering—and I am confident we will name—this post office after all of those who earned America's highest honor. I envision that the post office will bear the names and, in a book, the recitation of how they each earned America's highest honor. It has been inspiring to represent them. Those Medal of Honor recipients, I must mention, will include Navy corpsmen, and they will include officers and enlisted men. They will include all of those battles from World War II to tomorrow and the days beyond.

As I ask for this post office to be named, one that I have had the honor of authoring, I might note, for all of those who wonder why we name post offices, I believe, if they come to Camp Pendleton, they will find out why this post office bears the name of a medal and not any one soldier, sailor, marine, or airman.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, I want to thank the gentleman from California. There is nothing I can add, really, to the eloquence of his remarks, and it is fitting that he made them as the person in this body who is representing the men and women of Camp Pendleton.

I have been there, but I don't serve it. My brother served in the Navy, and I visited him many years ago when he was at Camp Pendleton, and I remember then, as a very young person, being awed by just the incredible display of patriotism that was embodied in that.

The other thing, as I listened to you, Mr. Chairman, what I thought was so good about this is that the whole ethic of the military is that you are in it for everybody else. As for the story about the Medal of Honor winner who was in the band but, before he was in the band, was on a burning tank and provided covering fire at great peril to himself, that is the ethic of the military that, I think, all of us here so admire.

So having a postal naming which doesn't specifically identify one person but identifies all of the recipients at the highest award that we can give to a military leader is a tremendous idea. In fact, I look forward to my next visit to Camp Pendleton, where, I think, like many Americans who will go visit, I will read this roster and will just stand in awe of the bravery that has been demonstrated by these people throughout our history.

□ 1430

So I really am glad that our remarks are recorded because this statement that the chairman gave, I think, is

going to be very good reading for all of us. I do join, of course, in supporting this naming. I think it is particularly suitable.

Mr. Speaker, 230 years of Camp Pendleton's existence, think about it. It is just an amazing facility, but more importantly, it has had hundreds of thousands of wonderful Americans who have learned about how to be a patriot, who have gone from there to face very difficult challenges when we needed their bravery to defend our country.

So I join the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) in urging our colleagues to support this naming—it is an especially glorious one—honoring all men and women of the military.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I have but two things to say. First of all, I want to thank the California delegation for their unique, bipartisan, unanimous support for this bill.

Lastly, whether it is that bandleader who was a bandleader first, but would have said, "I am an infantryman first," who served in World War II and died there in Korea, or it is the marines and corpsmen who have given their lives, their blood, their tears, their sweat, whether they were awarded the Medal of Honor, lesser medals, or were not fully recognized for their dedication, all of them, I now know, will have their daily activities, passing the post office or dropping a letter, they will have an opportunity to in fact realize that Congress is grateful for their contributions with the naming of this post office.

I urge support for the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5468.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLONEL M.J. "MAC" DUBE, USMC POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5331) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 73839 Gorgonio Drive in Twentynine Palms, California, as the "Colonel M.J. 'Mac' Dube, USMC Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5331

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. COLONEL M.J. "MAC" DUBE, USMC POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 73839 Gorgonio Drive in Twentynine Palms, California, shall be known and designated as the "Colonel M.J. 'Mac' Dube, USMC Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Colonel M.J. ‘Mac’ Dube, USMC Post Office Building”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) and the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5331, introduced by my fellow Californian, Mr. PAUL COOK, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 73839 Gorgonio Drive in Twentynine Palms, California, as the Colonel M.J. “Mac” Dube, U.S. Marine Corps Post Office Building.

First, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California, Congressman COOK, the author of the bill, to speak more about this Vietnam war veteran.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5331 would designate the facility that was already mentioned on Gorgonio Drive in Twentynine Palms as the Colonel M.J. “Mac” Dube, United States Marine Corps Post Office Building.

Mac passed away this year, but will always be remembered in Twentynine Palms as a United States Marine and a dedicated public servant.

Mac and I, ironically enough, both served as colonels at the same time, an honor I will always remember and cherish. Mac was a great marine. He served for over 30 years. He earned four Purple Hearts, multiple wars, four Bronze Stars with Combat “V,” and a Silver Star.

After a career as the Chief of Staff at the Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center, he retired in Twentynine Palms, where he went to work, ran for office, became the mayor, and became a council member. Then when he was done with that, he served in multiple county offices, oftentimes as a volunteer.

His children grew up there. He was deeply involved and was somebody that, ironically enough, was part of the Marine community on the military side and, obviously, the civilian community and the county side on the other side of the fence.

This is a tribute to a man who dedicated his life to serving his Nation, serving the Marine Corps, and serving the Twentynine Palms community. He left a legacy for all those who will come after him. He was always in

town. He gave so many things to so many people. He was the most generous individual I ever knew, and I think that he will always be remembered in the Twentynine Palms area for his hard work, his dedication, and his patriotism.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am delighted to join in support of this postal naming, and it is just such a pleasure to listen to the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK) talk about a friend he knew who was a fellow colonel and then to see what he did after his life of service in the military, his life of service with his own folks back home, and I look at some of the things he did, and I am just amazed.

He served in 46 combat missions. He earned four Purple Hearts. That means, basically, he dodged death at least four times. How he managed to do this and then put it all behind him—he probably never talked about it; instead, he preferred much more to just find a way to help folks back home when the bullets weren’t flying.

But he knew service in the military and service back home were equally important. This is an extraordinary person, and we are very honored that the gentleman is bringing this bill forward and that we will be able to recognize his contributions in the memory of a postal naming.

Mr. COOK. Will the gentleman yield for a comment?

Mr. WELCH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COOK. I thank the gentleman.

As I mentioned, I knew Mac very, very well, and I used to joke with him, and I said, “You know, I have two Purple Hearts, and it showed that I was dumb enough to not duck twice, and you have four of them. What does that say about your IQ?”

But he was a true American and would do anything, and I thank the gentleman from Vermont so much for his support of the bill.

Mr. WELCH. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK), and Mr. ISSA also thanks you.

It is a tough business we do here, but one of the things about these namings is that it allows us to remind ourselves of what we can aspire to be. I mean, these folks, in war and in peace, who just give themselves to public service selflessly and effectively and then earn the gratitude of the people back home, regardless of party, regardless of politics, they just are trying to do a good thing to make their community a better place and their country a stronger country.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. ISSA. I urge strong support for this bipartisan bill and yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5331.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. DANIEL P. RIORDAN POST OFFICE

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5386) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 11662 Gravois Road in St. Louis, Missouri, as the “Lt. Daniel P. Riordan Post Office”.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5386

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. LT. DANIEL P. RIORDAN POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 11662 Gravois Road in St. Louis, Missouri, shall be known and designated as the “Lt. Daniel P. Riordan Post Office”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Lt. Daniel P. Riordan Post Office”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) and the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, this bill, authored by Congresswoman ANN WAGNER of Missouri, recognizes the last full measure of support for Lieutenant Daniel P. Riordan, and I can add nothing more than the author will add, so I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in honor of a great hero.

On June 23, 2007, Missouri’s Second Congressional District lost a brave young man when United States Army First Lieutenant Daniel Riordan made the ultimate sacrifice for his country while serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to reflect on the life of this young patriot. Daniel Patrick Riordan was born to Rick and Jeanine Riordan on February 17, 1983. He had a twin brother, Nick, and an older sister, Suzanne.

After graduating from St. John Vianney High School in Kirkwood, Missouri, Dan attended Southeast Missouri State where he was in the Air Force ROTC program. After graduation, Dan decided to follow his father into the military and joined the U.S. Army, quickly becoming known as "Lieutenant Dan."

Lieutenant Dan became a tank commander, and in 2006, he was deployed to Iraq as part of Operation Iraqi Freedom. As a member of Demon Company in the First Cavalry Division, Dan served with courage and determination. Despite frequently being outnumbered in enemy territory, Dan was always out on point, leading his platoon into battle. Dan took his leadership responsibilities literally. As he put it, "How can I order my men forward if I'm not willing to go first?"

To those who knew Dan, his devotion to his country through service and sacrifice came as no surprise. He was both a fierce and dedicated warrior in the service of our country and a caring and loving gentleman who felt a duty to help those in need.

From a very young age, Dan showed sensitivity beyond his years. At the age of 5 or 6, while attending a funeral, Dan's mom found him sitting with an elderly woman. When she asked him why he was sitting with her, he said, "She looked sad and lonely." It was this kind of compassion that drew him to the U.S. military, his desire to serve, help, and protect those in need.

While at home on leave from Operation Iraqi Freedom, Dan consistently reassured his family that our country's military efforts were truly bringing empowerment and freedom to the people of Iraq. He believed in a cause greater than himself, that of freedom, democracy, and the dignity of all people.

While in the Army, Dan wrote his mother a letter in case he didn't return. One thing he said was, "Don't mourn for me, mom. Celebrate my life." So today, we celebrate First Lieutenant Daniel P. Riordan's life by designating the Sappington Branch Post Office in St. Louis, Missouri, as the Lt. Daniel P. Riordan Post Office.

The United States of America owes Dan a priceless debt that we will never be able to fully repay, but we can do our part to ensure that his memory lives on; therefore, it is my honor to sponsor H.R. 5386, a bill that names the Sappington Branch Post Office in Missouri's Second Congressional District after such a courageous young man, immortalizing a hero who gave up his life in service to the Nation that he loved.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the gentlelady for her eloquent description of a brave and strong person and a life well-lived, and I am touched by seeing that photograph of the young, strong, healthy, vibrant man who meant so much to his family, as he did to his country, and

your story about him as a 5-year-old boy, I found quite touching.

There was just something in him that probably did come from his family that made him, even without knowing why, want to serve, and you can just imagine that that carried forward not only to people in his community and family but to the people of Iraq.

I also was reading about how his original objective in the military was to serve as a pilot. We don't know what the story was as to how he ended up in a tank, but what you know about that story is that his fundamental goal was to serve. How he served was secondary.

□ 1445

He was in a tank, which, as we all know, was one of the most dangerous places any of our men and women in service could be during the war in Iraq.

So I want to thank the gentlewoman for a very inspiring and eloquent statement about a life well lived, about a man who gave his life on behalf of all of us in the United States of America.

Mrs. WAGNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. WAGNER. I would like to say that I have had the great pleasure and honor of sponsoring several of these post office namings for our fallen heroes, and I have to say it is one of the most moving, touching, and important things that we can do, I think, for our entire community and certainly for the families. So it is a great privilege and honor for me to support the Riordan family today, and I thank the gentleman for his kind words and the chairman for putting all of this forward.

Mr. WELCH. Likewise, we thank you for doing this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, I have no doubt that this will pass, as rightfully it should, but if I can take a moment, looking at that picture of the young lieutenant wearing his cavalry insignia, Armor is the only branch that I know of that has two insignias: one when you are stationed when you have heavy armor, one for the cav.

The fact is, in most wars, the enemy is ahead of you and you look for the enemy. In World War II and Korea, people talked about going to the front. In Iraq, there is no front. So every day Lieutenant Riordan knew he was at the front. Every day he knew in the light-armored vehicle he was riding in that, in fact, an IED could be cranked off either remotely or on his vehicle nearing it at any time.

Our men and women serving in Iraq and Afghanistan are not faced by an enemy who has a front. They are faced by an enemy that almost to a person hides behind improvised explosives. More of our soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen have died because of these

devices, not by an enemy at a front, but by a bomb on the road. Lieutenant Riordan was no different.

So when you look at his awards and you look at the way he lived and died, he wasn't fighting a war in which he went to the front to face an enemy; he faced that enemy, and at any moment his life could end, as it did end, by a sneak attack that had no face on it.

The courage of our men and women in Iraq and Afghanistan is greater in many ways than those who had a reprieve from the front from time to time and who knew when they were going toward their enemy, whether it was toward, if you will, heavy fire or sniper. In Iraq and Afghanistan in the past, the present, and now in the future, our soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen face an enemy that they will likely never see, and they are in peril virtually every moment of the day and night. That special relationship is one that I hope the American people understand no generation has faced the way this generation faces.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the bill and yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5386.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SERGEANT CORY MRACEK MEMORIAL POST OFFICE

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1499) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 278 Main Street in Chadron, Nebraska, as the "Sergeant Cory Mracek Memorial Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1499

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SERGEANT CORY MRACEK MEMORIAL POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 278 Main Street in Chadron, Nebraska, shall be known and designated as the "Sergeant Cory Mracek Memorial Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Sergeant Cory Mracek Memorial Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) and the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may

have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Army Sergeant Mracek was killed on January 27, 2004, while serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom. He died of wounds sustained during yet another roadside bomb attack in Iraq. He was only 26 years old, and he had been in Iraq for just 8 days.

Mr. Speaker, loved ones remember Sergeant Mracek as a man who loved Army life and was proud to serve his country. His bravery and his selflessness have inspired us all, and the naming of this post office in his memory is clearly appropriate.

It is my honor to ask the body to honor Sergeant Mracek's service and sacrifice by voting in favor of this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in supporting this postal naming bill. I see that we have the sponsor of the bill here.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) to speak directly about this brave American.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman. Thank you to Senators JOHANNIS and FISCHER and certainly my colleagues here in the House.

Mr. Speaker, under this legislation, the post office building in Chadron, Nebraska, would be named in honor of Sergeant Cory Mracek, a native of Chadron who was killed by an improvised explosive device in Iraq on January 27, 2004.

The son of Jim and Pat Mracek, Cory originally served with the Nebraska National Guard and transferred to Active Duty, where he served with distinction. Sergeant Mracek reenlisted after the September 11, 2001, attacks where he served as a paratrooper with the U.S. Army's 82nd Airborne.

Among other honors, Sergeant Mracek was posthumously awarded the Purple Heart and Bronze Star for his courage and dedication. Renaming the post office in Chadron in Cory's home town will be a symbol of gratitude to a hero who made the ultimate sacrifice for our country.

Mr. WELCH. I want to thank the gentleman for his remarks and for bringing this forward to our attention.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to comment, too, on how this individual, this man, two times in Korea and then decides he is going to go to Iraq, despite the well-known dangers to his own personal safety, again, another example of a brave American who is willing and did sacrifice his life on behalf of the security of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California, (Mr. ISSA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1499.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIRST LIEUTENANT ALVIN CHESTER COCKRELL, JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1093) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 130 Caldwell Drive in Hazlehurst, Mississippi, as the "First Lieutenant Alvin Chester Cockrell, Jr. Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1093

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FIRST LIEUTENANT ALVIN CHESTER COCKRELL, JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 130 Caldwell Drive in Hazlehurst, Mississippi, shall be known and designated as the "First Lieutenant Alvin Chester Cockrell, Jr. Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "First Lieutenant Alvin Chester Cockrell, Jr. Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) and the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1093, introduced by Senator THAD COCHRAN of Mississippi, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 130 Caldwell Drive in Hazlehurst, Mississippi, as the First Lieutenant Alvin Chester Cockrell, Jr. Post Office.

Mr. Speaker, this is yet another first lieutenant. First Lieutenant Cockrell served his country in World War II. He enlisted in the Marine Corps back in 1937. He was assigned to Company B, 1st Battalion, 7th Marines, Fleet Ma-

rine Force. He landed at Guadalcanal. It was his 24th birthday. It was September 18, 1942. First Lieutenant Cockrell led his platoon in assaulting a strongly held enemy position against heavy machine gun fire. During that battle, charging into the face of machine gun fire, something we know all too well for United States Marines, he was killed in action. He died in that engagement.

Mr. Speaker, we often recognize marines because they have given a great deal in this war, along with the other forces. We often recognize Iraq and Afghanistan, and on occasion, we recognize Vietnam veterans as we did today. It is unusual for this body to reach back, as Senator COCHRAN has done, and find such a fitting individual from a war so long ago, the war that gave us America's Greatest Generation, and realize that we have not yet finished thanking those who gave us the freedom to pursue our lives, every person on the floor perhaps having been born after Lieutenant Cockrell died.

So it is altogether fitting that, as we remember the freedoms we enjoy, the opportunity we enjoy, the economy we enjoy, the lieutenant gave his all for that freedom.

With that, I would urge passage, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My colleague mentioned that it is unusual we reach back. I think he would agree with me that it is wise that we do.

World War II changed the world; and we were so committed to the cause of freedom in World War II, and so many of our predecessors, citizens who served and died before we were born, won a war that would have changed the whole future of the world had we not succeeded. It was individual acts of heroism that made the difference.

Mr. Speaker, this life was a life well lived. His life was one dedicated to service, and First Lieutenant Alvin Cockrell deserves to be remembered. It is our responsibility to honor all of those who came before us, the members, as Mr. ISSA said, of the Greatest Generation, who won the most brutal but consequential war that has changed the history of the entire world.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues in fully supporting the naming of this post office after an American who served his country and gave his life, First Lieutenant Alvin Chester Cockrell.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, there is no question at all, this is, again, another befitting naming.

I would like to thank the Senator for reaching back and finding such a worthy candidate, and I would like to remind all of us, coming off of Veterans Day, that, in fact, this generation of veterans is departing but will be remembered in our hearts for the rest of our lives.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California, (Mr. ISSA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1093.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THADDEUS STEVENS POST OFFICE

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 885) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 35 Park Street in Danville, Vermont, as the "Thaddeus Stevens Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 885

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. THADDEUS STEVENS POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 35 Park Street in Danville, Vermont, shall be known and designated as the "Thaddeus Stevens Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Thaddeus Stevens Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) and the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I am going to defer my comments since the sole House Member from Vermont is available to make his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman. He is up to his usual courteous efforts, and I really do appreciate it. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are pretty proud in Vermont of Thaddeus Stevens, and we are here today in support of the naming of the post office at 35 Park Street in Danville, Vermont, a tiny community, a proud community, in what is called the Northeast Kingdom of Vermont, to name the post office there the Thaddeus Stevens Post Office.

Thaddeus Stevens was born in Danville, Vermont, in 1792. He attended

Peacham Academy. It is still there. He went on to the University of Vermont and then graduated from Dartmouth College. That was in 1814.

□ 1500

He then made a big decision and moved to Pennsylvania to study law, but he never left his Vermont values behind. He was elected to the Pennsylvania State House of Representatives. He served 4 years as a member of the Anti-Masonic Party. In 1849, he was elected to the 34th Congress of the United States, serving as a Whig until 1853—and Mr. ISSA, you'll be happy to know—as a Republican from 1859 until his death in 1868.

As a member of the House of Representatives, he was a very strong voice of opposition to slavery, advocating against the fugitive slave provision in the Compromise of 1850 and actively helping runaway slaves to escape to Canada using the Underground Railroad. We are all proud of that, but in Vermont we are particularly proud that Thaddeus Stevens did this. Our State, Mr. Speaker, was the first State in its Constitution—and we were the 14th State in the Union—to ban slavery. And Thaddeus Stevens took that Vermont point of view and advocated it in the United States House of Representatives.

By 1866, Stevens had helped the Republicans gain control of Congress and set the stage for post-Civil War reconstruction in the South. In his role on the Joint Committee on Reconstruction, Thaddeus Stevens helped draft the Reconstruction Act of 1867 as well as the 14th Amendment, prohibiting States from denying citizens of life, liberty, or property without the due process of law, a constitutional amendment that has done so much to extend the dream in this country of equal opportunity to all of our citizens.

Since Vermont, as I mentioned, was the first State to ban slavery, doing so in its Constitution, I would like to think that Thaddeus Stevens' Vermont beginnings did inform his actions later in life. Today his legacy for promoting and defending equality lives on in Vermont and across the country. I am proud that we are honoring his life's work through the passage of this postal naming bill.

As we prepare to send S. 885 to the President's desk, I would like to thank Senator SANDERS for his leadership in working with the Danville community to draft this bill. Senator SANDERS, when he first came to Vermont so many years ago, lived up to the Northeast Kingdom. I also want to thank Senator LEAHY for his very important support. And I want to thank, of course, Chairman ISSA and Ranking Member CUMMINGS for helping to shepherd this piece of legislation through before the end of this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this bill to acknowledge Thaddeus Stevens' public service and steadfast dedication to the equality of all citizens regardless of race.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

When all speakers have said all that needs to be said and there is only one speaker left, he can't say anything original, so I will simply thank the Congressmen and the Senators for recognizing one of the first Republicans and one of the first Republican principles, one that is no longer owned by any party but in fact owned by all Americans. I move for passage.

I urge support of S. 885, introduced by Senator SANDERS of Vermont which would designate the postal facility located at 35 Park Street in Danville, Vermont, as the "Thaddeus Stevens Post Office".

Thaddeus Stevens was born in Danville, Vermont on April 4, 1792. He attended nearby Peacham Academy and went on to study at the University of Vermont and Dartmouth College. After graduating from Dartmouth, Stevens moved to Pennsylvania to study law. He practiced law in Gettysburg, and spent four years as a member of the Pennsylvania State Legislature.

Thaddeus Stevens served in the U.S. House of Representatives from 1849 to 1853 and from 1859 until his death in 1868. He is best remembered for being a fierce opponent of slavery and discrimination against African-Americans. He was instrumental in the passage of the 14th Amendment to the Constitution and fought for African-American rights during Reconstruction.

I ask my colleagues to honor the courageous actions and momentous contributions of this great American by voting in favor of S. 885.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 885.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIALIST THEODORE MATTHEW GLENDE POST OFFICE

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1512) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1335 Jefferson Road in Rochester, New York, as the "Specialist Theodore Matthew Glende Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1512

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SPECIALIST THEODORE MATTHEW GLENDE POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1335 Jefferson Road in Rochester, New York, shall be known and designated as the "Specialist Theodore Matthew Glende Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other

record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Specialist Theodore Matthew Glende Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) and the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in strong support of S. 1512, which was introduced by Senator CHUCK SCHUMER of New York. The bill would designate the postal facility located at 1335 Jefferson Road in Rochester, New York, as the Specialist Theodore Matthew Glende Post Office.

Specialist Theodore Matthew Glende died while serving during Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan. He was killed on July 27, 2012, when his unit was in the field training and came under enemy attack. During the attack, Specialist Glende was killed by a mortar round that hit a trailer where he was helping wounded comrades take shelter. A member of his unit said that he saved the lives of five of his fellow soldiers in the attack. Specialist Glende was only 23 years old.

He was a native of Rochester, New York. Theodore graduated from the McQuaid Jesuit High School in 2007 and enrolled at Niagara University. He soon felt the calling to join the United States Army and enlisted. He is survived by his wife, Alexandra, whom he married just months before leaving for his first tour of duty.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and privilege to pay tribute to this great American. I ask all of my colleagues to support S. 1512 and the naming of this post office after this brave fallen soldier and hero of our time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the consideration of this bill, S. 1512, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service at 1335 Jefferson Road in Rochester, New York, as the Specialist Theodore Matthew Glende Post Office.

As was mentioned, Mr. Glende was born in Rochester, New York. He graduated from McQuaid Jesuit High School in 2007 and studied military science at Niagara University. Theodore always knew he wanted to be a soldier and defend his country. A participant in the Niagara University ROTC program, he joined the Army

and was assigned to the Airborne Brigade Combat Team in Italy. But after just a few months, Specialist Glende was deployed to Afghanistan.

On July 27, 2012, his unit was attacked and Specialist Glende began caring for five of his fellow soldiers after the unit's medic was injured. Tragically, Specialist Glende was hit by mortar fire. But because of his efforts, the testimony confirms, the five men that he was assisting all survived.

Specialist Glende is survived by his wife, Alexandra, to whom he was only married a short time; his parents; and his younger brother.

Mr. Speaker, we should pass this bill to honor the courage exhibited by this young man in the face of overwhelming danger. Because of Specialist Glende's brave actions, five American lives were saved on the battlefield. He deserves our respect for his honorable service. I urge passage of S. 1512.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I also urge support for the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1512.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHIEF JOSEPH E. WHITE, JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5142) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 113 West Jackson Street in Rich Square, North Carolina, as the "Chief Joseph E. White, Jr. Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5142

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CHIEF JOSEPH E. WHITE, JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 113 West Jackson Street in Rich Square, North Carolina, shall be known and designated as the "Chief Joseph E. White, Jr. Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Chief Joseph E. White, Jr. Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) and the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may

have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise in support of H.R. 5142, which was introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD). The bill would designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 113 West Jackson Street in Rich Square, North Carolina, as the Chief Joseph E. White, Jr. Post Office Building.

Rich Square Police Chief White served in law enforcement for over 30 years. Tragically, Chief White was shot and killed with his own .45-caliber service revolver on July 16, 2000, while investigating a possible gas drive-off or gas station runaway at a local gas station. He was shot after he stopped the vehicle which was wanted in connection with the incident. He is survived by his wife and several of his grown children and grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, Chief White made the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty. We owe a large debt of gratitude for his many years of service. The community and the entire North Carolina delegation support this naming. I support and recommend passage of H.R. 5142.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman WELCH for yielding time. Let me also thank Chairman ISSA and Ranking Member CUMMINGS for bringing my bill to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5142, a bill that I introduced that will designate the post office in Rich Square, North Carolina, as the Chief Joseph E. White, Jr. Post Office Building. Every Member of the North Carolina House delegation has cosponsored my bill, and I ask my colleagues to join me in passing it today.

Joseph Edward White, Jr., was born on January 12, 1939, in Hertford County, North Carolina, in the town of Ahoskie to Joseph White, Sr., and the former Emma Jane Collins. In 1957, at the age of 18, Mr. White enlisted in the United States Navy and bravely served our country for the next 20 years. After he retired from the Navy, Mr. White and his wife, the former Joyce Risper, moved to Northampton County and settled in the town of Woodland, North Carolina, which would ultimately become home for them and for their three children: Cynthia, Cheryl, and Terrance.

Mr. White found his calling in law enforcement and began his career with the Woodland Police Department in 1980, where he served as an officer and ultimately as chief of police. He later

moved to the Northampton County Sheriff's Office and served as a deputy sheriff and also worked as a corrections officer at Odom Correctional Institution, located just outside Jackson, North Carolina.

In 1999, Mr. Speaker, Mr. White became the chief of police for a small town but a town rich in legacy, the town of Rich Square. Sadly, Chief White's stellar career in law enforcement that saw him ascend to the position of chief of police of two North Carolina police departments was tragically cut short.

After just a year of serving as police chief for the town of Rich Square, Chief White was savagely killed in the line of duty. On the afternoon of Sunday, July 16, 2000, Chief White was on duty and was alerted that a vehicle had filled up at a gas station but left the station without paying. Chief White spotted the vehicle and initiated a traffic stop. It was during the stop that Chief White's .45-caliber service weapon was wrested away from him by the man that he had stopped. The man used Chief White's own weapon against him tragically, ending his life just 5 months before his retirement.

It took nearly 3 years, but the man that committed this atrocious crime was identified and he was arrested in Lafayette, Louisiana, on May 1, 2003. He was sentenced to life in prison on September 12, 2005.

Chief White, a brave veteran and dedicated public servant, a beloved husband, colleague, and friend, lost his life in the most tragic of ways, but his memory will live on forever. Naming the post office in Rich Square in Chief White's honor is but a small symbol by a grateful Nation for his life that was dedicated to serving others.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Chief Joseph E. White, Jr., by voting "aye" on H.R. 5142.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. Issa) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5142.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1515

LOW-DOSE RADIATION RESEARCH ACT OF 2014

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5544) to increase the understanding of the health effects of low doses of ionizing radiation, as amend-

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5544

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Low-Dose Radiation Research Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. LOW DOSE RADIATION RESEARCH PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Department of Energy Office of Science shall carry out a research program on low dose radiation. The purpose of the program is to enhance the scientific understanding of and reduce uncertainties associated with the effects of exposure to low dose radiation in order to inform improved risk management methods.

(b) STUDY.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall enter into an agreement with the National Academies to conduct a study assessing the current status and development of a long-term strategy for low dose radiation research. Such study shall be completed not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act. The study shall be conducted in coordination with Federal agencies that perform ionizing radiation effects research and shall leverage the most current studies in this field. Such study shall—

(1) identify current scientific challenges for understanding the long-term effects of ionizing radiation;

(2) assess the status of current low dose radiation research in the United States and internationally;

(3) formulate overall scientific goals for the future of low-dose radiation research in the United States;

(4) recommend a long-term strategic and prioritized research agenda to address scientific research goals for overcoming the identified scientific challenges in coordination with other research efforts;

(5) define the essential components of a research program that would address this research agenda within the universities and the National Laboratories; and

(6) assess the cost-benefit effectiveness of such a program.

(c) RESEARCH PLAN.—Not later than 90 days after the completion of the study performed under subsection (b) the Secretary of Energy shall deliver to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a 5-year research plan that responds to the study's findings and recommendations and identifies and prioritizes research needs.

(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term "low dose radiation" means a radiation dose of less than 100 millisieverts.

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to subject any research carried out by the Director under the research program under this Act to any limitations described in section 977(e) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16317(e)).

(f) FUNDING.—No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated under this section. This Act shall be carried out using funds otherwise appropriated by law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) and the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Mem-

bers may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 5544, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise here today to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5544, the Low-Dose Radiation Research Act of 2014.

Humans are exposed on a daily basis to much natural background radiation, and some get additional low-dose exposure from medical procedures or from industrial radiation sources; yet sufficient data is not available for experts to definitively conclude whether there are health risks associated with low-dose radiation.

This lack of understanding prevents regulatory agencies from setting more precise radiation dose limits, as well as it impairs authorities' decisionmaking capabilities to address potential radiological events and advise patients for medically-based radiation exposures, all of which pose an unnecessary burden on society.

As a medical doctor, as a family doctor, and a true fiscal conservative, I recognize that this major gap in understanding is detrimental to the health and well-being of Americans and will additionally contribute to unnecessary economic burdens if we do not deal with it immediately.

This legislation seeks to address the limited understanding of potential health risks associated with low-dose radiation by leveraging the Nation's current expertise in low-dose radiation while proposing a long-term strategy to address the current gaps of knowledge in this area.

This legislation will be carried out using funds otherwise already appropriated by law and ensure that the Department of Energy is following congressional direction to focus its work on issues of long-term importance.

Passage of this legislation will help resolve what we do not know in the field of low-dose radiation for the betterment of medicine, for emergency response planning, and for industrial safety, not to speak about helping patients and Americans know what this all entails. This will show that we do not take for granted the livelihood of our fellow Americans.

This bill is a commonsense win, and I hope that all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in supporting this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss H.R. 5544, the Low-Dose Radiation Research Act of 2014. This bill authorizes an important research program carried out by the Department of Energy's Office of Science to examine the health impacts of exposure to low doses of radiation, such as doses resulting from certain medical tests, nuclear waste

cleanup activities, or even terrorism events like dirty bombs.

This bill builds on DOE's unique biological research expertise and capabilities, which actually led to the establishment of the successful Human Genome Project that paved the way toward breakthroughs in modern medicine today.

Mr. Speaker, the bill also authorizes a National Academies study to identify current scientific challenges in this area and to help guide the program's long-term research agenda well into the next decade.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2014, cosponsored by every Democratic member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, includes very similar language to what we now see in H.R. 5544, so we have no objection to this bill and support its passage.

We also look forward to working with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle—and, of course, on the other side of the Capitol—on far more comprehensive, bipartisan legislation to reauthorize the America COMPETES Act, as is strongly recommended by many of the most respected industry and academic leaders and organizations across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Georgia for his leadership and for his service in the Congress, and of course, we wish him well as that term comes to an end.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my good friend from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS). I heard her comments, and they are very nice comments. She and I have been friends and sometimes on the opposite sides of issues, but she is a very dear friend and a great lady, and I appreciate her well wishes. I thank you very much. I appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5544, the Low-Dose Radiation Research Act of 2014, will increase our understanding of low-dose radiation. This research is critical for physicians and decision makers to more accurately assess potential health risks in this area.

I thank my friend, Chairman of the Oversight Subcommittee, Dr. PAUL BROUN, for introducing this legislation.

Many Americans are exposed to a broad range of low doses of ionizing radiation. These range from cosmic background radiation to medically based procedures, which include X-rays and CT scans.

However, our current approach to radiation safety relies on an outdated assumption that because high doses of radiation are harmful that much lower radiation doses are also harmful.

This assumption is not based on a reliable scientific foundation and prevents patients from making informed decisions about diagnostic exams and can lead to overly restrictive regulations.

The Department of Energy's (DOE) Low Dose Radiation Research Program within the

Office of Science focuses on the health effects of ionizing radiation and resolving the uncertainties in this area that currently exist.

Unfortunately, this program has not been a priority at DOE over recent years and has seen systematic budget cuts.

H.R. 5544 ensures the continuance of this important research program.

This legislation also directs the National Academies to formulate a long-term strategy to resolve uncertainties of whether and to what extent low dose radiation may pose health risks to humans. The bill also stipulates that the Academies must consider the most up-to-date studies in this field of research.

And finally, the bill requires the Department of Energy to develop a five-year research plan that responds to the Academies' recommendations.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5544, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS FEDERAL CHARTER AMENDMENT

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5441) to amend the Federal charter of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States to reflect the service of women in the Armed Forces of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5441

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REFLECTION OF SERVICE OF WOMEN IN THE ARMED FORCES IN THE FED- ERAL CHARTER OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) ORGANIZATION.—Section 230101(a) of title 36, United States Code, is amended by striking “men” and inserting “veterans”.

(b) PURPOSES.—Section 230102(3) of such title is amended by striking “widows” and inserting “surviving spouses”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H.R. 5441, the bill currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars is one of our largest and most lauded veterans organizations. It has successfully fought for veterans' rights for over a century and its members provide millions of hours a year in community service.

Among its goals are to “assist worthy comrades” and to “perpetuate the memory and history of our dead and to assist their widows and orphans.” Our veterans from the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan are in a better place because of activities of the VFW.

Membership in the VFW is open to Korean war veterans and veterans who have “served honorably as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States—in a foreign war, insurrection, or expedition in service that has been recognized as campaign-medal service; and is governed by the authorization of the award of a campaign badge by the United States Government or in an area which entitled the individual to receive special pay for duty subject to hostile fire or imminent danger.”

Membership does not require that a servicemember have engaged in actual combat, only that they served in a combat zone.

Congress provided the VFW with a Federal charter in 1936. Robert Wallace, executive director of the VFW's Washington office, has sent a letter to the Judiciary Committee requesting that its charter be amended to be gender neutral. This is in recognition, Mr. Speaker, of the many female members of the VFW and their invaluable contributions to our military.

Mr. Wallace stated that:

Today, our military consists of both men and women who honorably put duty and service before themselves. Consistent with the growing number of military women who serve at all levels, women are taking leadership roles throughout our organization. The VFW strongly believes that combat service, not gender, determines VFW membership eligibility. That is why we opened our membership to women over 35 years ago. However, our congressional charter does not reflect this reality.

As the Congressional Research Service reported last year, almost 300,000 “female servicemembers have been deployed for contingency operations in Iraq and Afghanistan.” In approximately 12 years of combat operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, over 800 women have been wounded and over 130 have died. Women have been recognized for their heroism, two earning Silver Star medals.

H.R. 5441, introduced by Congressman JEFF MILLER, makes the changes sought by the VFW and is strongly supported by the organization. I commend Representative MILLER for introducing the bill.

The VFW's current charter provides that the VFW is a “national association of men who as soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen served this Nation in wars, campaigns, and expeditions on foreign soil or in hostile waters.”

H.R. 5441 would replace “men” with “veterans.” The current charter provides that one of the purposes of the

organization is “to perpetuate the memory and history of our dead and to assist their widows and orphans.” The bill would replace “widows” with “surviving spouses.”

I urge my colleagues to support this meritorious bill that reflects the valor of women in our Armed Forces.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as has been said, this bill makes a small but important change to the Federal charter of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. As has been mentioned, it would amend the charter to become gender neutral by replacing “men” with “veterans” and “widows” with “surviving spouses.” I think doing this aligns the charter with the actual makeup of the organization today, and I totally support the change.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States has been serving veterans of our Armed Forces for over 100 years and traces its roots to the Spanish-American War. Only men were permitted to serve in the military when the organization was chartered in 1936, and of course, we know, since that time, things have changed a great deal.

The role of women in the military has greatly expanded. In fact, two of our colleagues—Congresswoman TULSI GABBARD of Hawaii and Congresswoman TAMMY DUCKWORTH of Illinois—both served with both distinction and honor in our military services and now serve with us as colleagues in the House.

Women serve in varied roles throughout the Armed Forces, and they have made many important sacrifices for the country. Women in fact now make up almost 10 percent of the total veterans population, and the Department of Veterans Affairs predicts they will represent nearly 18 percent of veterans by the year 2040.

In recognition of these facts, the VFW opened its membership to women over 35 years ago, and they certainly deserve our commendation for doing so.

Generally, as has been said many times, it should be up to the organization, not Congress, to decide who may and may not be a member of that organization. That is one of the many reasons why Members on both sides of the aisle have long supported the committee's policy against creating new Federal charters.

Even so, there is no policy against amending existing charters, and if such amendments are needed to align the charter to actual reality, then there is no reason to prevent such an amendment.

In fact, I also support the reason for this change. The Veterans of Foreign Wars seeks this change because it “strongly believes that combat service, not gender, determines membership eligibility.” I could not agree more, and I can only applaud the VFW for initiating this change and coming to

the Judiciary Committee, seeking out the author of the bill and working with us in a bipartisan basis to get here today.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the author of the bill, and this was unanimously approved by the Judiciary Committee.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER), a champion for veterans' rights and chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding the time. I also want to thank Chairman GOODLATTE and the ranking member for speeding this through the Judiciary Committee.

I rise in support of this piece of legislation, which is a simple bill, Mr. Speaker, designated to update the congressional charter of the VFW to reflect today's active duty and veteran population by changing, as we have already heard, the word “men” to “veterans” and the word “widows” to “surviving spouses.”

Women veterans have in fact been eligible as members of the VFW since 1978, but like many things, it sometimes takes a little time for paperwork to catch up. I think VFW Commander in Chief John Stroud said it best in describing why they have requested this change:

We are not changing our congressional charter because it's politically correct. We're changing it because being an eligible veteran is what's important to our great organization, not one's gender, and changing “widows” to “surviving spouses” is more representative of today's military.

Women do in fact comprise over 16 percent of today's military force, and obviously, that means that they are making up an ever-increasing share of America's 22 million veterans as they return to civilian life.

I ask my colleagues to join Chairman GOODLATTE, Ms. LOFGREN, and myself in supporting H.R. 5441.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman MILLER for his leadership in this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of H.R. 5441, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5441, which will amend the Federal charter of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States to reflect the service of women in the Armed Forces.

This legislation is a common-sense update of an 80-year-old charter to better reflect the makeup of the modern military—namely, the inclusion of women in prominent roles throughout several branches of the military. The Veterans of Foreign Wars is a premier Veterans Service Organization, with more than 2 million members of all ages across our great country.

All Veterans are heroes regardless of their gender, and this legislation reflects that equality in the formal charter of a remarkably successful organization that exists to support all Veterans, and their spouses.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5441, which amends the federal charter of the Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW) to reflect the service of women in the Armed Forces of the United States.

As approved by Congress in 1936, the VFW charter provides that the VFW is a “national association of men who as soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen served this Nation in wars, campaigns and expeditions on foreign soil or in hostile waters[.]”

The charter further provides that one of the purposes of the organization is “to perpetuate the memory and history of our dead, and to assist their widows and orphans[.]”

By replacing the terms “men” with “veterans” and “widows” with “surviving spouses,” H.R. 5441 modifies the VFW charter to make it gender-neutral and reflect the reality that women have and continue to serve in combat theaters in defense of the United States.

At the time the charter was created, only men were permitted to serve in the military. Today, both women and men are permitted to serve in the military and over the last few years, women have become more involved in combat operations.

For example, between September 2001 and February 28, 2013, 299,548 female service members have been deployed for contingency operations in Iraq and Afghanistan during which time more than 800 women have been wounded and over 130 have died.

As of February 29, 2013, 16,407 female members were currently deployed in contingency operation according to the Department of Defense.

Women have been tested in battle and proved their heroism, earning numerous awards and commendations, including two Silver Star medals.

The expansion of roles for women in the armed forces has evolved over decades.

Under a Defense Department policy promulgated in 1994 policy, women could not be assigned to units, below the brigade level, whose primary mission is to engage in direct combat on the ground.

The practical effect of this policy meant that women were barred from infantry, artillery, armor, combat engineers, and special operations units of battalion size or smaller.

On January 24, 2013, however, then-Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta rescinded that policy, thus enabling women to serve in combat units.

The leadership and rank and file of the VFW strongly supports changing the national charter to make it gender-neutral:

Today, our military consists of both men and women who honorably put duty and service before themselves. Consistent with the growing number of military women who serve at all levels, women are taking leadership roles throughout our organization. That is why we opened our membership to women over 35 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, according to the VFW practice, it is combat service, not gender, that determines VFW membership eligibility.

Over 2 million women veterans have courageously served our country and defended our

freedoms for over 100 years, and their countless contributions and sacrifices must not be overlooked.

In the 18th Congressional District of Texas, there are 29,757 veterans, 3,219 of which are women.

Women veterans fortified the crucial role of women in the military, and females currently serving in the military continue to break down barriers, such as:

Admiral Michelle Howard, the Navy's first female four-star admiral; Army General Ann E. Dunwoody, the U.S. military's first female four-star officer; Dr. Mary E. Walker, the only woman who has been awarded the Medal of Honor.

As Anne S. (Sosh) Brehm, 1st Lt., USA NC, a World War II veteran said, "Let the generations know that the women in uniform also guaranteed their freedom."

Each year, I participate in the Annual Women in the Military Wreath Laying Ceremony at Arlington National Cemetery to honor all women who have defended America throughout history.

The Women in Military Service for America Memorial serves as a reminder of the patriotism and bravery of women who have served in the United States Armed Services, and also tells their stories of service, sacrifice, and achievement.

Women veterans have a passion for service and an unfathomable amount of bravery that is truly worthy and deserving of our recognition, admiration, and commendation.

H.R. 5441 modifies VFW's federal charter to reflect current practice and reality and, accordingly, I support the bill and urge all members to do so as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5441.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1422, EPA SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD REFORM ACT OF 2013; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4012, SECRET SCIENCE REFORM ACT OF 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4795, PROMOTING NEW MANUFACTURING ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM NOVEMBER 21, 2014, THROUGH NOVEMBER 28, 2014

Mr. BURGESS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-626) on the resolution (H. Res. 756) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1422) to amend the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1978 to provide for Scientific Advisory Board member qualifications, public participation, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4012) to prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency from proposing, finalizing, or disseminating regulations or assessments based upon science that is not transparent or reproducible; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4795) to promote new manufacturing in the United States by providing for greater transparency and timeliness in obtaining necessary permits, and for other purposes; and providing for proceedings during the period from November 21, 2014, through November 28, 2014, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REMOVING A USE RESTRICTION TO CERTAIN LAND IN ROCKINGHAM COUNTY, VIRGINIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5162) to amend the Act entitled "An Act to allow a certain parcel of land in Rockingham County, Virginia, to be used for a child care center" to remove the use restriction, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 378, nays 1, not voting 55, as follows:

[Roll No. 520]

YEAS—378

Adams
Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivoglio
Berra (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Bonamici

Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)

Brownley (CA)
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)

Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowe
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Malcoln
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott

McGovern
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascarelli
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman

| | | |
|---------------|------------|--------------|
| Shimkus | Tiberi | Wasserman |
| Shuster | Tierney | Schultz |
| Simpson | Tipton | Waters |
| Sinema | Titus | Weber (TX) |
| Sires | Tonko | Webster (FL) |
| Smith (MO) | Turner | Welch |
| Smith (NE) | Upton | Wenstrup |
| Smith (TX) | Valadao | Westmoreland |
| Southerland | Van Hollen | Williams |
| Speier | Vargas | Wilson (SC) |
| Stewart | Veasey | Wittman |
| Stivers | Vela | Wolf |
| Stockman | Velázquez | Womack |
| Swalwell (CA) | Visclosky | Woodall |
| Takano | Wagner | Yarmuth |
| Terry | Walberg | Yoder |
| Thompson (CA) | Walden | Yoho |
| Thompson (PA) | Walorski | Young (AK) |
| Thornberry | Walz | Young (IN) |

NAYS—1

Sanford

NOT VOTING—55

| | | |
|--------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Bachmann | Grijalva | Roby |
| Bishop (GA) | Gutiérrez | Rohrabacher |
| Bishop (NY) | Hall | Runyan |
| Blackburn | Hanna | Rush |
| Blumenauer | Harper | Ryan (OH) |
| Buchanan | Herrera Beutler | Sanchez, Loretta |
| Bucshon | Huizenga (MI) | Schwartz |
| Campbell | Kind | Scott, David |
| Ciilline | Lucas | Slaughter |
| Clyburn | Marchant | Smith (NJ) |
| Coble | McAllister | Smith (WA) |
| Coffman | McIntyre | Stutzman |
| Conyers | Meng | Thompson (MS) |
| Cooper | Miller, Gary | Tsongas |
| Davis, Danny | Moore | Waxman |
| Dingell | Negrete McLeod | Whitfield |
| Duckworth | Pastor (AZ) | Wilson (FL) |
| Gardner | Price (NC) | |
| Garrett | Rice (SC) | |

□ 1854

Messrs. TAKANO and CARNEY changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 520, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 520, had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 520, had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

ASHLAND BREAKWATER LIGHT TRANSFER ACT

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4049) to amend the Act to

provide for the establishment of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes, to adjust the boundary of that National Lakeshore to include the lighthouse known as Ashland Harbor Breakwater Light, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4049

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Ashland Breakwater Light Transfer Act”.

SEC. 2. BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT TO INCLUDE LIGHTHOUSE.

Public Law 91–424 (16 U.S.C. 460w et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) In the first section as follows:

(A) In the matter preceding subsection (a)—

(i) by striking “islands and shoreline” and inserting “islands, shoreline, and light stations”; and

(ii) by inserting “historic,” after “scenic.”.

(B) In subsection (a)—

(i) by striking “the area” and inserting “The area”; and

(ii) by striking “; and” and inserting a period.

(C) In subsection (b), by striking the final period.

(D) By inserting after “1985,” the following:

“(c) ASHLAND HARBOR BREAKWATER LIGHT.—

“(1) The Ashland Harbor Breakwater Light generally depicted on the map titled ‘Ashland Harbor Breakwater Light Addition to Apostle Islands National Lakeshore’ and dated February 11, 2014, located at the end of the breakwater on Chequamegon Bay, Wisconsin.

“(2) Congress does not intend for the designation of the property under paragraph (1) to create a protective perimeter or buffer zone around the boundary of that property.”.

(2) In section 6 as follows:

(A) By striking “The lakeshore” and inserting:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The lakeshore”.

(B) By inserting “this section and” before “the provisions of”.

(C) By adding after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) FEDERAL USE.—Notwithstanding subsection (c) of the first section—

“(1) The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating may operate, maintain, keep, locate, inspect, repair, and replace any Federal aid to navigation located at the Ashland Harbor Breakwater Light for as long as such aid is needed for navigational purposes; and

“(2) in carrying out the activities described in paragraph (1), such Secretary may enter, at any time, the Ashland Harbor Breakwater Light or any Federal aid to navigation at the Ashland Harbor Breakwater Light, for as long as such aid is needed for navigational purposes, without notice to the extent that it is not possible to provide advance notice.

“(c) CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY.—Pursuant to existing authorities, the Secretary may enter into agreements with the City of Ashland, County of Ashland, and County of Bayfield, Wisconsin, for the purpose of cooperative law enforcement and emergency services within the boundaries of the lakeshore.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). Pursuant to

the rule, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

□ 1900

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Ashland Harbor Breakwater Light is an operational lighthouse located near Ashland, Wisconsin, and is currently owned and managed by the U.S. Coast Guard. In 2007, the Coast Guard announced its intent to give up ownership of the Ashland light, and only the National Park Service expressed interest in maintaining the public access to it.

H.R. 4049 adjusts the boundaries of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore to include the light station, but protects the ability of the Coast Guard to maintain the light as an aid to navigation.

Congressman SEAN DUFFY should be commended for his work on this issue, which also has the support of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,

Washington, DC, November 14, 2014.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On June 19, 2014, the Committee on Natural Resources ordered reported without amendment H.R. 4049, the Ashland Breakwater Light Transfer Act by unanimous consent. The bill was referred primarily to the Committee on Natural Resources, with an additional referral to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

I ask that you allow the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee to be discharged from further consideration of the bill so that it may be scheduled by the Majority Leader. This discharge in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. The Committee on Natural Resources concurs with the mutual understanding that when the House considers H.R. 4049, it will consider amended text negotiated between the staffs of our two committees. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include this letter and your response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Natural Resources, as well as in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND
INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REP-
RESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, November 17, 2014.

Hon. DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HASTINGS: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4049, the Ashland Breakwater Light Transfer Act, as ordered reported by the Committee on Natural Resources. I appreciate your inclusion of changes requested by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure as this bill moves forward.

I agree to allow the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure to be discharged from consideration of H.R. 4049 with the understanding that this discharge does not affect the Committee's jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and does not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, I expect the negotiated text to be the text considered on the floor. Finally, as stated in your letter, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I fully expect the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure to be represented on the conference committee.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter and for agreeing to include a copy of this letter in the Committee on Natural Resources filed bill report, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, I would like to commend Representative DUFFY, with whom I share lakeshore on the world's largest freshwater lake and also borders on our district. I tell you, Mr. DUFFY, I found the television commercial with you and your family to be my favorite commercial of the last election, of which there were not many favorable commercials for anyone.

So it is with a fun and joyful spirit that I rise in support of your legislation to prove to those beautiful children of yours that a lot of us really like each other and know how to get along and support the efforts of one another.

Mr. Speaker, with that in mind, H.R. 4049 transfers ownership and management of the Ashland Harbor Breakwater Light to the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore. Thanks to the leadership of the late Democratic Senator Gaylord Nelson, Congress established the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in 1970.

The area consists of 21 islands and 70 acres of shoreline in Lake Superior. It is a popular tourist destination in the summer and home to the 35,000-acre Gaylord Nelson Wilderness area.

Apostle Islands already manages eight historic lighthouses which were transferred to the National Park Service in 1986. This bill would add one more to the collection and contribute to the mission of protecting these historic cultural resources. Additionally,

the text of this bill ensures that the Coast Guard will continue to maintain historic access to the lighthouse.

We support passage of this bill and look forward to working with the majority to advance more legislation that helps to enhance our national parks.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR) for yielding, and I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his kind remarks about my ads, which I know there weren't many positive ads in the Duluth market, but I did have one. So I appreciate that, Mr. NOLAN, and thank you for your support of what is a very important bill for folks in northern Wisconsin.

I have a picture of what this actual lighthouse looks like right off the community of Ashland. This bill, H.R. 4049, is the bill that will transfer the Ashland Breakwater Light from the Coast Guard to the National Park Service.

This lighthouse has stood here for over 100 years, standing strong on the shores of Lake Superior in dark nights and in storms, guarding our ships in their safe passage to our harbor, but also welcoming back travelers who have left the greater Ashland community and on the way home.

I had a chance to live in Ashland for 10 years, raising my children. My second-born son was born there. I think my third, fourth, and fifth were born there as well. I lose count after a while, but it is a great community. This lighthouse is a big part of our identity in Ashland.

Right now, the lighthouse has an uncertain future because the Coast Guard has indicated several times, most recently in 2012, that they are going to give up management of the lighthouse. No public entity, aside from the National Park Service's Apostle Islands National Lakeshore have stepped forward and indicated that they would obtain and maintain this very important lighthouse in our community.

Absent this legislation, there is no guarantee that this historic lighthouse would be maintained and continue to operate and be accessible for educational purposes. H.R. 4049 will allow the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore to maintain the lighthouse alongside, as Mr. NOLAN and I think Mr. LABRADOR mentioned, eight other lighthouses they maintain.

Just a little trip down history lane: in 1986, the Coast Guard transferred eight of these lighthouses to the National Park Service, but they didn't transfer this one. All we are doing right now is saying let's redraw that line and include this one with the other eight, so the National Park Service can now manage this lighthouse as well.

If I were looking at this bill, I might say, "Well, I have a concern if I am a fisherman or a boater who might use

the waters outside the lighthouse." I can guarantee you that the way this is written and the way the line is drawn there will be no additional rules or regulations coming from the Feds that are going to affect your ability to fish or boat right around the lighthouse.

We have adequately addressed that concern in this House by having so many different folks come together, people across the aisle who share a border and a lake, but also share a love for the environment and all it has to offer.

We also have support of the National Park Service who supports this bill; the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore; the U.S. Coast Guard; the Wisconsin DNR; the Wisconsin Historical Society; the Ashland Chamber of Commerce, which is very important; the city of Ashland; and a lot of local outdoor recreational communities.

With that, I would urge passage of H.R. 4049, and I want to thank everyone for their support for what is a very important bill to my community in northern Wisconsin.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4049, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IDAHO COUNTY SHOOTING RANGE LAND CONVEYANCE ACT

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5040) to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to Idaho County in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5040

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Idaho County Shooting Range Land Conveyance Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) COUNTY.—The term "County" means Idaho County in the State of Idaho.

(2) MAP.—The term "map" means the map entitled "Idaho County Land Conveyance" and dated April 11, 2014.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO IDAHO COUNTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after notification by the County and subject to valid existing rights, the Secretary shall convey to the County, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in subsection (b).

(b) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in subsection (a) consists of approximately 31 acres of land managed by the Bureau of Land Management and generally depicted on the map as “Conveyance Area”.

(c) MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall finalize the legal description of the parcel to be conveyed under this section.

(2) MINOR ERRORS.—The Secretary may correct any minor error in—

(A) the map; or

(B) the legal description.

(3) AVAILABILITY.—The map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(d) USE OF CONVEYED LAND.—The land conveyed under this section shall be used only as a shooting range.

(e) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—The Secretary shall require the County to pay all survey costs and other administrative costs necessary for the preparation and completion of any patents for, and transfers of title to, the land described in subsection (b).

(f) CONDITIONS.—As a condition of the conveyance under subsection (a), the County shall agree—

(1) to pay any administrative costs associated with the conveyance including the costs of any environmental, wildlife, cultural, or historical resources studies;

(2) to release and indemnify the United States from any claims or liabilities that may arise from uses carried out on the land described in subsection (b) on or before the date of the enactment of this Act by the United States or any person; and

(3) to accept such reasonable terms and conditions as the Secretary determines necessary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. NOLAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am the author of H.R. 5040, which directs the Secretary of the Interior to convey a 31-acre parcel of land to Idaho County, Idaho, to use for public recreation.

Idahoans deeply value their Second Amendment rights, and many use firearms for hunting and shooting sports. The safe and proper use of firearms is often a tradition passed down from generation to generation. People need a safe designated area where they may sight in their rifles and teach safe firearms practices.

Nearly 6 years ago, a county in my district, Idaho County, began the process of searching for a suitable location to install a shooting range to serve the

needs of the county residents interested in exercising their Second Amendment rights.

Idaho County, which is 83 percent controlled by the Federal Government, began working with the local BLM office in Cottonwood, Idaho, to identify land that the BLM could transfer to the county for use as a shooting range.

The BLM identified a buried landfill in the county as a suitable location because the site is already used casually by recreational hunters and the general public as a shooting range. The land also provides the proper safety barriers because it is situated on an elevated bench, approximately 240 feet above a nearby road and surrounded by hills. The county and the local BLM officials agreed the site was perfect for a shooting range.

The county began the process of seeking an administrative transfer from the BLM, but soon ran into procedural roadblocks. The site of the proposed shooting range is within a portion of the Lower Salmon River, which was identified by the BLM for potential inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Because of existing BLM regulations, the parcel cannot be transferred to the county administratively.

As my staff and I met with the Idaho County commissioners to come up with a solution, we determined the only path forward was to introduce legislation in Congress to convey the land from the BLM to the county. My bill, the Idaho County Shooting Range Land Conveyance Act, would convey the 31-acre parcel to Idaho County for use as a shooting range.

The BLM has spent a great deal of time and resources studying the proposed site and has determined the land would be perfect for a shooting range. The local BLM office in Cottonwood has been instrumental in gathering necessary environmental data to support the land conveyance, and I am grateful for their ongoing efforts to work with my staff and finally resolve this issue.

My office has also worked closely with the Idaho County commissioners and Idaho County sheriff to develop a plan to manage the land for public use as a shooting range. Part of the plan includes allowing Idaho County law enforcement to use the range to conduct firearms training and qualifications.

Idaho County has waited nearly 6 years for this process to be completed. Idaho County residents want a safe, remote location to exercise their Second Amendment rights, and my bill will provide a solution that is long overdue.

I urge support for the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Representative LABRADOR for the work he has done on behalf of his constituents and their recreational activities in their future.

H.R. 5040 transfers 31 acres of public land to Idaho County for the purpose of

establishing a public shooting range. The county will pay the administrative costs associated with the transfer and release the United States from any future liability.

Historically, a bill of this nature would contain stronger language to guarantee that the transferred land would continue to be used for a public purpose or the ownership would automatically revert back to the United States Government.

These so-called reversionary clauses ensure that, once transferred, the land is not sold or developed in a way not intended by Congress.

It is important for Congress to establish clear and fair expectations when transferring management of an asset owned by the American taxpayer. We encourage Idaho County to use the land as intended by this bill.

With that said, this bill merits our support, and we urge its adoption by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5040.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1915

GRAND PORTAGE BAND PER
CAPITA ADJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3608) to amend the Act of October 19, 1973, concerning taxable income to members of the Grand Portage Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3608

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Grand Portage Band Per Capita Adjustment Act”.

SEC. 2. EQUAL TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PER
CAPITA INCOME FOR PURPOSES OF
FEDERAL ASSISTANCE.

Paragraph (4) of section 7 of the Act of October 19, 1973 (25 U.S.C. 1407(4)) is amended by striking “pursuant to the agreements of such Band” and inserting “or the Grand Portage Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians, or both, pursuant to the agreements of each Band”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 3608 would protect certain funds paid by the State of Minnesota and held by the United States in trust for the Grand Portage Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians from Federal and State taxation. Under the bill, the tribe may distribute these funds to its members, and these payments won't be counted against the members' eligibility for Federal financial assistance as long as each payment does not exceed \$2,000.

The payments made by the State stem from a 1988 settlement in which two Minnesota Chippewa tribes agreed to forgo the exercise of certain treaty hunting and fishing rights. In 1999, legislation was introduced to protect these State settlement payments from taxation. However, by the time the bill was enacted into Public Law 106-568, only one of the two tribes was granted the tax relief.

The Subcommittee on Indian and Alaska Native Affairs held a hearing on H.R. 3608. Neither the hearing nor a staff review of the legislative history for Public Law 106-568 reveals any explanation for the exclusion of the Grand Portage Band from the tax relief granted to its sister tribe. Principles of fairness and equity suggest that both bands of Minnesota Chippewa be accorded equal treatment. H.R. 3608 accordingly amends the applicable statute to provide the Grand Portage Band the same tax benefits.

The Committee on Natural Resources ordered H.R. 3608 reported by unanimous consent, and Chairman CAMP of the Ways and Means Committee and Chairman GOODLATTE of the Judiciary Committee have graciously agreed by letter to expedite consideration of this bill by not exercising their jurisdiction. As always, we appreciate their cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, November 5, 2014.

Hon. DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HASTINGS: I am writing with respect to H.R. 3608, the "Grand Portage Band Per Capita Adjustment Act," which the Committee on Natural Resources reported favorably on September 18, 2014. As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions in H.R. 3608 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I agree to discharge our Committee from further consideration of this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action without mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 3608 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and asks that you support any such request.

I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 3608, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration of H.R. 3608.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, November 13, 2014.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on Judiciary, Rayburn HOB, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 3608, the Grand Portage Band Per Capita Adjustment Act. As you know, the Committee on Natural Resources ordered reported the bill on September 18, 2014. I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on the Judiciary will forego action on the bill.

The Committee on Natural Resources concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 3608 at this time, the Committee on the Judiciary does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on the Judiciary represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include your letter and this response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Natural Resources, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, November 17, 2014.

Hon. DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HASTINGS: I am writing concerning H.R. 3608, the "Grand Portage Band Per Capita Adjustment Act," which was reported by the Committee on Natural Resources on September 18, 2014 and is scheduled for floor consideration today.

The Committee on Ways and Means received an additional referral on this bill given its impact on federal income taxation and subsequent calculation of benefits under Social Security, which are within the Committee on Ways and Means' Rule X jurisdiction. However, in order to expedite this legislation for floor consideration, the Committee will forego action on this bill. This is being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 3608, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in bill report and the Congressional Record during floor consideration.

Sincerely,

DAVE CAMP,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, November 17, 2014.

Hon. DAVE CAMP,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
Longworth HOB, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 3608, the Grand Portage Band Per Capita Adjustment Act. As you know, the Committee on Natural Resources ordered reported the bill on September 18, 2014. I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on Ways and Means will forego action on the bill.

The Committee on Natural Resources concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 3608 at this time, the Committee on Ways and Means does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Ways and Means represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include your letter and this response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Natural Resources, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Natural Resources Committee Chairman HASTINGS, who has served so well and so honorably in this Chamber—his absence will be missed as he retires—and, of course, Ranking Member DEFAZIO, and to Chairman YOUNG, whom I had the good fortune to initially serve in this Chamber about 40 years ago, and Ranking Member HANABUSA of the Subcommittee on Indian and Alaska Native Affairs for their support of this bill. I also want to thank the staff for their work and their diligent efforts on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in simple terms, this bill corrects a technical mistake in existing law, thereby allowing members of the Grand Portage Band of Lake Superior Chippewa to exclude up to \$2,000 in payments from the State of Minnesota from their taxable income.

By way of background, in 1988, the Grand Portage Band and the Bois Forte Band of Chippewa entered into an agreement by which they would relinquish certain harvest rights and privileges accorded under the treaty of 1854 in return for annual per capita payments from the State of Minnesota.

In the year 2000, Congress passed the Omnibus Indian Advancement Act, which stipulated that a portion of these per capita payments should not count as income for the band members.

The problem was the legislative language included only the Bois Forte Band. The Grand Portage Band was inadvertently, accidentally left out, and, as a result, many members of the Grand Portage Band have been denied financial assistance and other benefits they are entitled to because their income appears higher than the law permits.

So this bill simply corrects the mistake by amending the act of October 9, 1973, to allow members of the Grand Portage Band to exclude up to \$2,000 in per capita income payments from the State of Minnesota from their taxable income. It is the correct and the fair thing to do.

Let me also point out, Mr. Speaker, that this bill marks another step toward restoring the letter and the spirit of the 1854 treaty between the Federal Government and the Chippewa of Lake Superior, a treaty marked by serious violations from the very beginning as the waves of settlers were permitted onto the lands the agreement reserved for the Indians in perpetuity.

I often point to my colleagues that the bust of Chief Buffalo of La Pointe greets them, or greets us as we enter into the House Chamber from the west front. Chief Buffalo was recognized as the Head Chief of the Greater Chippewa Nation, and at the age of 92 years of age, he led a tribal delegation to Washington to meet with President Fillmore and paved the way for the treaty of 1854 to stop the removal of Lake Superior Chippewas from their native homes.

It was quite a trip. They left Wisconsin's Madeline Island by birch bark canoe—mind you, a 92-year-old man—traveling all the way to Sault Ste. Marie. From there, they took a steamer bound for Detroit, and then on by steamer to Buffalo, New York. Then the railroad took them to Albany, New York, where they boarded another steamboat to New York, and finally back onto the train to Washington, D.C., where they made their case to the President of the United States.

So, in asking my colleagues to support this bill, I ask them to also remember Chief Buffalo and the diligence and the long, hard work and the long and difficult trail that is often so often required to do the right thing when we are representing people that we have been, in our case, elected to represent.

It is a good lesson in point in a time and life where we have a kind of a fast-food mentality and everybody is expecting things to happen now. The voyage, the extraordinary effort that Chief Buffalo made, is a lesson to us all.

So here we are, 160 years later, still trying to fulfill the results of that important mission that he made. This legislation to restore a small piece of a larger trust relationship is part of that journey.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this bill, and I thank my colleagues for their bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3608.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, at 1 p.m., Congressman TED DEUTCH and I will convene a subcommittee hearing on the dangers of a nuclear deal with Iran, the dangers that this could pose for the United States and global security interests.

Retired General Michael Hayden, former Director of both the NSA and the CIA, will be testifying to share his concerns about Iran's past weaponization efforts and the guarantees needed to monitor and verify this agreement. In fact, he has warned that, were he still in his role as CIA Director, he "would feel compelled to advise the President that the agreement could not be adequately verified."

Mr. Speaker, Congress needs to remain engaged. We need to continue our oversight. We need to use all the tools that we have available to us, including strengthening and increasing sanctions against this regime, in order to ensure that the President does not sign an agreement that is not in our national security interests.

CENTERS FOR MEDICARE & MEDICAID SERVICES RESCINDS PROHIBITION ON SPEECH-GENERATING DEVICES UNLOCKING

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, currently, more than 113 million Americans are facing long-term disease or disability. Significant policy advancements have recently been signed into law to encourage the development of drugs for those with limited medical options and continued efforts to get advanced diagnostic tests to patients more quickly. Yet a segment of the population remains who are in the midst of an ongoing struggle.

As someone who spent most of my professional career serving those with life-changing disease and disability, a shared goal of health care providers is to improve the quality of life for their patients. This is particularly true when it comes to those with limited speech, whether they have suffered from stroke, trauma, or progressive neuro-

logical diseases such as ALS, MS, or Huntington's.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that after years of recommendations, earlier this month the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services has lifted prohibitions on unlocking of speech-generating devices from accessing our technologies such as email or Internet access.

Moving forward, our goals should be the continued empowerment of those facing disease and disability, to ensure their dignity, mobility, and communication abilities can be enhanced in our modern world.

THE PLIGHT OF SAEED ABEDINI

(Mr. FITZPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring awareness to the plight of Iranian American Saeed Abedini, a 34-year-old Christian pastor who was unlawfully arrested by the Islamic Republic of Iran for refusing to renounce his Christian faith.

Saeed, along with his wife, Naghmeh, are prominent in the house church movement throughout Iran, credited with establishing around 100 churches in 30 different Iranian cities.

After the election of Mahmoud Ahmadinejad in 2005, the church movement became the subject of authoritarian crackdown, prompting the Abedinis to return to the United States.

On September 26, 2014, Saeed Abedini returned to Iran to visit family and continue his humanitarian work to establish an orphanage. During this trip, Saeed was arrested and charged with undermining national security. In early 2013, Saeed was transferred from Tehran to the Rajai Shahr prison in the town of Karaj, an institution known for harsher and often life-threatening conditions.

I call on the administration to act swiftly for the immediate return of this American to his family.

AN IMMIGRATION SYSTEM THAT IS IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE UNITED STATES

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, the American people sent a strong message to Washington, one that was apparently not received by the President. His latest threat to unilaterally grant amnesty to millions of illegal immigrants would not only serve as a massive abuse of power, but also make clear the unprecedented disconnect between this administration and our citizens.

The American people deserve a government that can demonstrate both

the ability and the commitment to enforcing our Nation's laws, not a President who continually sidesteps Congress and the American people to advance an agenda which appeals exclusively to one side of the aisle.

I urge the President to end the political ploys to go around the laws we have on the books and start working together toward an immigration system that is in the best interest of the U.S.—not one that endangers our citizens, even takes some of their lives and some of the lives of our law enforcement officers, but truly one that secures our borders, respects the rule of law, stops violent criminals at the border, and prevents future illegal immigration.

I call on the President to work with Congress.

MARCH TOWARD A MORE PERFECT UNION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege to once again have this opportunity to stand on the House floor and to anchor the Congressional Black Caucus' Special Order hour, where today we want to discuss some of the issues and challenges confronting this country that we hope this newly constituted Congress will be prepared to take up.

As we move into the 114th Congress, there is still a lot of business that is undone over the remaining few weeks that we have left during this session, but a whole lot of challenges that we have got to confront as we move forward.

□ 1930

One hundred fifty years ago or so, President Abraham Lincoln publicly pondered the question: How do we create a more perfect Union?

President Lincoln asked that question at a time when the country was tearing itself apart in the context of the Civil War. Since the conclusion of that war—since President Lincoln publicly pondered that question—year after year, month after month, century after century, we certainly have made some progress, significant progress, here in America, but we still have a long way to go, and it is still relevant for us to ask the question: How do we create a more perfect Union?

Where do we go from here?

So I am pleased that so many of my distinguished colleagues from the Con-

gressional Black Caucus have come to the floor today to share their thoughts and their insights and their policy prescriptions in our continuing march toward a more perfect Union.

Let me first just yield to the dynamic chairperson of the Congressional Black Caucus, who has provided such great leadership to this caucus, to this Congress, and to this country during her career, the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio, Chairwoman MARCIA FUDGE.

Ms. FUDGE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to thank my colleagues JEFFRIES and HORSFORD for leading the Congressional Black Caucus Hour. It is an issue that, I think, is important to this entire country, and it should be a priority for all Members, not just members of the Congressional Black Caucus—a discussion on where Congress goes from here in pursuit of a more perfect Union.

Mr. Speaker, even before the final ballots were counted from the midterm elections, conservatives began sharing their priorities for the upcoming Congress.

Instead of promising to improve our health care system, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle began promising to renew their campaign to repeal the Affordable Care Act—a campaign that has wasted millions in taxpayer dollars, with 53 unsuccessful votes.

Instead of searching for common ground, they are still committed to finding a way to impeach President Barack Obama.

Instead of using the next Congress to create more opportunities for the American people, the decision has already been made to continue efforts to obstruct and undermine the President.

None of these actions will move our Nation forward or do what is best for the country. We must do something more than advance a partisan, political agenda. It is irresponsible, Mr. Speaker, and is an insult to the very public that gave us this awesome responsibility in the first place. We were elected to represent the American people—all of the American people. Let's write and pass legislation that will make their lives easier and their futures more promising. It is time for this Congress to unite and move forward together. This is not the time for doubling down on the tactics of distraction, obstruction, and confusion.

We have the opportunity now to lay a foundation for the 114th Congress that is built upon bipartisan cooperation and a shared commitment to doing what is best for all of our citizens. I urge my colleagues to join the CBC in doing the people's work.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished chair for her observations and, certainly, for pointing out that, while we should be coming together to march toward perfecting our Union, there are some, inexplicably, who want to march toward impeachment before even seeing Presidential action, the same type

of folks who, from the moment that Barack Obama was sworn in as President, believe he exceeded his authority just by raising his right hand and taking the oath of office. So let's just hope that we can hit the refresh button on the partisanship, on the obstruction, on the obfuscation and can come together to do the business of the American people.

Certainly, the gentleman who I would yield to next has been a great patriot. He has helped to bring our Constitution to life. For tens of millions of Americans, he is one of this country's greatest freedom fighters, a civil rights icon, and a distinguished Member of Congress. It is my honor and my privilege to now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, Congressman JOHN LEWIS.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and my colleague, Congressman JEFFRIES, for organizing this Special Order.

Thank you for all that you do. Thank you for speaking up and speaking out. Thank you for finding a way to get in the way.

Mr. Speaker, our march toward a more perfect Union has been long, hard, and tedious, but we must continue to move forward. I know there are forces that want to stop us, slow us down, and take us back, but as a Nation and as a people, we have made too much progress to turn back now. Through hard work, discipline, and with the blessing of the Almighty, we can—and we will—move to redeem the soul of America and create a more perfect Union.

The American people are ready.

They have grown by leaps and bounds to build bridges of understanding between diverse communities. As their Representatives, will we follow their lead? Can we work together in this body as one people, one family, who live in the same house, one house—the American house? We don't have to be mean to each other. We don't have to put each other down.

My work in the movement taught me—my faith has taught me and many others—to respect the dignity and the worth of every human being. There is some good in the worst of us because everything that is was made by our Creator. That is why we must respect the worth and dignity and that spark of the divine in each one of us.

As A. Philip Randolph—a dean of Black leadership, the visionary who planned the historic March on Washington in 1963 and the founder of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters—once said: “We may have all come here on different ships, but we're all in the same boat now.”

My colleagues, my brothers and sisters, we must keep the faith. We must press toward the mark of the public good and put our personal ambitions aside.

As Mr. JEFFRIES did a few moments ago, let me paraphrase the words of a great Republican President who lived

in a more divisive time even than in our own.

He said:

Brave men, both living and dead, have consecrated the American soil with their tears, their sweat, and their blood. The world will little note nor long remember what we said here, but it will never forget what we did here. We must be dedicated . . . to the great tasks remaining before us . . . and make sure they did not sacrifice in vain, that this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom and that the government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the Earth.

Thank you, Mr. JEFFRIES.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Thank you, Congressman LEWIS, for those very eloquent thoughts and for continuing to really function as the conscience of the CBC as our caucus functions as the conscience of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is now my distinct honor and privilege to yield to someone who I served with on the Budget Committee. She is a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives. She is a fighter for the people, for the disenfranchised, and is a voice for the voiceless. It is my honor to yield to the very distinguished gentlewoman from California, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you very much.

First, let me thank the gentleman from New York, Congressman JEFFRIES, for this very important moment and theme tonight of "Where do we go from here?" But also for your leadership in conducting these Special Orders to make sure that the American people really know the truth about what is taking place here in Washington, D.C., and also to hear the voice of conscience from the Congressional Black Caucus, such as we just heard from our great warrior, Congressman JOHN LEWIS.

Also, I want to thank Congressman HORSFORD for being part of this for the last couple of years in terms of his tremendous leadership.

Mr. Speaker, the other night, I had an event with young people in my district. It is a lecture series that is sponsored by the Martin Luther King Freedom Center. Congressman LEWIS knows these young people. They travel with me every year to Selma-Montgomery-Birmingham. We started the center in the nineties, and these young people's mission in life is to make sure that the new generation of leaders understands, one, that violence is not an option and, secondly, that we all are in this together and that we should be united as a country and fight for the American Dream for all.

The topic of the lecture series of two nights ago was "Where do we go from here?" We had White students in the audience. We had African American, Latino, and Asian Pacific American young people, middle-aged people, and old people. It was held at my alma mater, at Mills College. It was really amazing. We had the cofounder of the United Farm Workers, Dolores Huerta, and former State Senator Art Torres.

We talked about "where do we go from here?" as a community in Oakland and also throughout the country. What we need to do here is, really, to get back to work for the American people, and that is what we heard over and over and over at our lecture series.

Unfortunately, ever since the Republicans took control of the House of Representatives, we see governing through extortion and brinksmanship, including a government shutdown that cost the taxpayers \$24 billion. I hope that is not where we go from here. Now we are looking at—or at least some are saying that they are eyeing—another shutdown and are refusing to act on immigration while planning another series of votes to repeal the Affordable Care Act. They have even gone so far as to threaten impeachment because our President has continued to lead where they have failed.

Where do we go from here, Congressman JEFFRIES? Let's hope not there. I hope we go where the young people in my community talked about the other night.

The threats about a government shutdown over immigration reform are outrageous. My district is a very diverse and dynamic district. That is what makes it, really, a great place for my constituents to live, work, do business, and raise a family. Yet we have many, many pockets of poverty. It is home to a vibrant immigrant community. Families from all over the world, many of them—and they told me again the other night—are feeling the pain each and every day of our broken immigration system. It has been more than 500 days since the Senate passed bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform.

We need to have an up or down vote. Families deserve that. Time is really running out. We have 3 weeks of session left, so we need to get something done. That is where we need to go from here. If Congress fails to act on immigration reform, our President can—and he should—take action to keep families from being torn apart. Just like every President since Dwight D. Eisenhower, our President should act, but as the President has said, immigration reform should come from Congress. It should come from us. That is what my community said in terms of moving forward. Let's get it done in the next couple of weeks. We have a bipartisan bill. Let's come together and have a vote. Our colleagues across the aisle need to put our economy ahead of partisanship. That means stopping their repeated attempts at eliminating access to affordable, quality health care for millions of Americans.

□ 1945

This past weekend marked the beginning of the second year of open enrollment under the Affordable Care Act. Repealing the Affordable Care Act and its protections for families would hurt all of our constituents. It would make health care less affordable and less ac-

cessible; yet every time Republicans vote to dismantle the Affordable Care Act, they make it perfectly clear that they believe charging women more for being a woman is okay, denying victims of domestic violence coverage is okay, and allowing insurance companies to increase premiums to increase profits is also okay. That is not what the American people need.

Where do we go from here? Let's not go there. Millions have been covered, and let's move forward to make sure our country has universal accessible affordable health care for all. It is a basic human right, so we need to get back to doing the work of the American people, the work of forming a more perfect Union.

Finally, I just want to point out an article. There was a recent editorial in The New York Times from Nicholas Kristof in which he discusses the historical and structural issues that continue to perpetuate racial disparities between Blacks and Whites today, and I would like to submit that article for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker.

[From Op-Ed Columnist, Nov. 15, 2014]

WHEN WHITES JUST DON'T GET IT, PART 4

(By Nicholas Kristof)

When I write about racial inequality in America, one common response from whites is eye-rolling and an emphatic: It's time to move on.

"As whites, are we doomed to an eternity of apology?" Neil tweeted at me. "When does individual responsibility kick in?"

Terry asked on my Facebook page: "Why are we still being held to actions that took place long ago?"

"How long am I supposed to feel guilty about being white? I bust my hump at work and refrain from living a thug life," Bradley chimed in. "America is about personal responsibility. . . . And really, get past the slavery issue."

This is the fourth installment in a series of columns I've written this year, "When Whites Just Don't Get It," and plenty of white readers have responded with anger and frustration at what they see as the "blame game" on race. They acknowledge a horrific history of racial discrimination but also say that we should look forward, not backward. The Supreme Court seems to share this view as it dismantles civil-rights-era rulings on voting rights.

As Dina puts it: "I am tired of the race conversation. It has exasperated me. Just stop. In so many industries, the racial ceiling has been shattered. Our president is black. From that moment on, there were no more excuses."

If only it were so simple!

Of course, personal responsibility is an issue. Orlando Patterson, the eminent black sociologist, notes in a forthcoming book that 92 percent of black youths agree that it is a "big problem" that black males are "not taking education seriously enough." And 88 percent agree that it's a big problem that they are "not being responsible fathers." That's why President Obama started "My Brother's Keeper," to cultivate more prudent behavior among men and boys of color.

But we in white society should be equally ready to shoulder responsibility. In past articles in this series, I've looked at black/white economic inequality that is greater in America today than it was in apartheid South Africa, at ongoing discrimination against African-Americans in the labor market and at

systematic bias in law enforcement. But these conversations run into a wall: the presumption on the part of so many well-meaning white Americans that racism is a historical artifact. They don't appreciate the overwhelming evidence that centuries of racial subjugation still shape inequity in the 21st century.

Indeed, a wave of research over the last 20 years has documented the lingering effects of slavery in the United States and South America alike. For example, counties in America that had a higher proportion of slaves in 1860 are still more unequal today, according to a scholarly paper published in 2010. The authors called this a "persistent effect of slavery."

One reason seems to be that areas with slave labor were ruled for the benefit of elite plantation owners. Public schools, libraries and legal institutions lagged, holding back working-class whites as well as blacks.

Whites often don't realize that slavery didn't truly end until long after the Civil War. Douglas Blackmon won a Pulitzer Prize for his devastating history, "Slavery by Another Name," that recounted how U.S. Steel and other American corporations used black slave labor well into the 20th century, through "convict leasing." Blacks would be arrested for made-up offenses such as "vagrancy" and then would be leased to companies as slave laborers.

Job and housing discrimination also systematically prevented blacks from accumulating wealth. The Federal Housing Administration and other initiatives greatly expanded home ownership and the middle class but deliberately excluded blacks.

That's one reason why black families have, on average, only about 6 percent as much wealth as white households, why only 44 percent of black families own a home compared with 73 percent for white households.

The inequality continues, particularly in education. De jure segregated schools have been replaced in some areas by de facto segregation.

Those of us who are white have a remarkable capacity for delusions. A majority of whites have said in opinion polls that blacks earn as much as whites and are as healthy as whites. In fact, black median household income is \$34,598, compared with \$58,270 for non-Hispanic whites, according to census data. Black life expectancy is four years shorter than that of whites.

Granted, race is just one thread in a tapestry. The daughters of President and Michelle Obama shouldn't enjoy affirmative action preference (as their dad has acknowledged), while disadvantaged white kids should.

Yet one element of white privilege today is obliviousness to privilege, including a blithe disregard of the way past subjugation shapes present disadvantage.

I've been on a book tour lately. By coincidence, so has one of my Times Op-Ed columnist colleagues, Charles Blow, who is African-American and the author of a powerful memoir, "Fire Shut Up in My Bones." I grew up in a solid middle-class household; Charles was primarily raised by a single mom who initially worked plucking poultry in a factory, and also, for a while, by a grandma in a house with no plumbing.

That Charles has become a New York Times columnist does not mean that blacks and whites today have equal access to opportunity, just that some talented and driven blacks manage to overcome the long odds against them. Make no mistake: Charles had to climb a higher mountain than I did.

We all stand on the shoulders of our ancestors. We're in a relay race, relying on the financial and human capital of our parents and grandparents. Blacks were shackled for

the early part of that relay race, and although many of the fetters have come off, whites have developed a huge lead. Do we ignore this long head start—a facet of white privilege—and pretend that the competition is now fair?

Of course not. If we whites are ahead in the relay race of life, shouldn't we acknowledge that we got this lead in part by generations of oppression? Aren't we big enough to make amends by trying to spread opportunity, by providing disadvantaged black kids an education as good as the one afforded privileged white kids?

Can't we at least acknowledge that in the case of race, William Faulkner was right: "The past is never dead. It's not even past."

Ms. LEE of California. Kristof states that he has "looked at Black-White economic inequality that is greater in America today than it was in apartheid South Africa, at ongoing discrimination against African Americans in the labor market, and at systematic bias in law enforcement."

So young people of color, especially young men, have been left behind in the economic recovery. It is leaving them behind, and far too often, they are marginalized and forgotten. The poverty rate for African Americans is 27.2 percent, more than two-and-a-half times the rate of poverty of White Americans. Nobody in our country should have to live below the poverty line. We are the wealthiest and most powerful country in the world.

The African American unemployment rate is 10.9 percent, nearly twice the national average. Young men of color are stopped and frisked at will. They are more incarcerated than any other group. The jobs that are available don't pay enough to get by while our safety net and nutrition programs continue to be hacked and slashed by House Republicans.

Beyond the lack of opportunity, police misconduct and the criminal justice system are constant reminders of the tragic inequality which is still persistent in the daily life of Black America.

Where do we go from here? Let's move forward, but we have got to remember that the deaths of Michael Brown and Trayvon Martin and Eric Garner and Oscar Grant—one of my constituents—their deaths are tragic examples of the senseless murder of young Black men.

As the mother of two Black men and two Black grandsons, I have to have many uncomfortable conversations with them, how to walk, how to talk, how to interact with the police.

This is not just my reality, but the reality of millions of other Black mothers and grandmothers and fathers and grandfathers. This is something no parent should have to do. No one should be afraid of the police who are sworn to protect and serve them. These are issues that Members of Congress must take leadership in addressing. This is where we must go from here.

Finally, let me just say the work of building a more perfect Union is not just rhetorical. As Members of Congress, we really do have a unique opportunity to do just that.

To quote our drum major for justice—who Congressman LEWIS had the privilege and honor to work with—Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., he said, "A genuine leader is not a searcher for consensus but a molder of consensus." We have the privilege tonight to remind this body that we are the molder of consensus.

Thank you again, Congressman JEFFRIES, for the opportunity to speak with you this evening.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Thank you, Congresswoman LEE, for your very eloquent observations and for laying out a clear pathway as it relates to many of the challenges that we have got to confront here in America and certainly amongst those challenges that you spoke to, the notion that we have got a broken criminal justice system that in far too many communities has placed a target on the back of young African American and Latino men in a way inconsistent with the democratic values of this country and the notion that we were all created equally, and so I look forward to partnering with you on many of these issues, as we all collectively move forward in this wonderful body.

We have also been joined here today by another civil rights champion, someone who has fought for the disenfranchised and to make sure that everyone has equal opportunity under the law, the distinguished gentleman from the Lone Star State of Texas, and I am pleased now to yield to Congressman AL GREEN.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Thank you very much, Congressman JEFFRIES. I also thank in his absence the gentleman from Nevada, Congressman HORSFORD. The two of you have been almost inseparable when it comes to these Special Order hours. I want to compliment you on the outstanding job that you have done.

I would also like to compliment Congressman HORSFORD for the outstanding job that he has done on the Financial Services Committee. He brought his talents. He brought his brilliance, and he has represented his constituents exceedingly well, and I know that in the annals of history, when they look back through the vista of time, it will be said that he served us well in the Congress of the United States of America.

With reference to the relevant question of the hour, as it relates to a more perfect Union, as we ponder and query where we go from here, it was appropriate, I think, that you introduced this topic by referencing President Lincoln.

It was appropriate because you are eminently correct. It was a time of great turmoil when he announced that he would issue the Emancipation Proclamation, and in January of 1863, when he issued the Emancipation Proclamation, the country was in the midst of a Civil War, being torn apart.

There was much to be said about his announcement that he would issue the

Emancipation Proclamation. There was great debate, and there were many people who said that it should not be done, that it was not worth the paper it would be written on, to be quite candid with you, it was said, because it would only free the slaves in the States that had left the Union, States that, quite candidly, at the time, he had no control over.

But he issued the Emancipation Proclamation, and I thank God that he did, because by issuing the Emancipation Proclamation, he laid the foundation for the 13th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America that was in fact executed in December 1865.

But for the Emancipation Proclamation, I don't know that I would be standing here in the Congress of the United States of America tonight. By issuing that Emancipation Proclamation, he changed the course of history.

Dr. King was right, "The arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends towards justice." However, it doesn't do it on its own accord. It takes the hand of man and women to bend it, so I am pleased that he did so.

I am also pleased that there was another opportunity for a President to forge a more perfect Union. President Harry Truman had the opportunity in 1948 to issue an executive order, as was the case with Lincoln and the executive order for the Emancipation Proclamation. He issued an executive order to desegregate the military.

There was much to be said about it. In fact, that executive order led to the birth of the Dixiecrats. There was a split in the Democratic Party because the Honorable Harry Truman decided that he would issue Executive Order 9981, to desegregate the military.

He issued it, the military was desegregated, and I contend that this was also one of the many reasons why the country itself moved along to desegregation and integration.

These were two outstanding and well-noted executive orders issued by Presidents of the United States. If President Lincoln could issue an executive order—an Emancipation Proclamation—if Harry Truman could issue an executive order—to desegregate the military—surely, President Barack Obama can issue an executive order to liberate many people who are living in the shadows of life, an immigration declaration, if you will. I believe the President should issue this order, notwithstanding all that is being said.

There was much being said and much being done when Lincoln issued his executive order, much said and much being done when Truman issued his, much said and much being done now, but I think the President should do this, and I think he should be bold when he does it because he will be lifting people out of the shadows of life.

I am confident that while many will be angry with him, God will not. I think God will smile on the President for issuing this executive order.

More than 15,000 executive orders have been issued. Not one President has ever been impeached for issuing an executive order, not one. There is talk of impeaching President Obama.

If we didn't impeach Lincoln and we didn't impeach Truman and we didn't impeach Reagan and we didn't impeach many of the other Presidents who have signed the more than 15,000 executive orders, I don't think that we ought to impeach President Obama.

Finally this, as an aside: there is much talk about the President's legacy and what he has done to form a more perfect Union while being President, if you will, but all of this talk about his legacy misses the mark, in my opinion, because there are many who think that the Affordable Care Act will be the centerpiece of his legacy.

I think it is a great piece of legislation. I supported it. I still support it. There are many who think that saving the auto industry would be his legacy. I think this is significant, exceedingly so. I supported what he did.

There are others who believe that his work in human rights and human dignity, especially as it relates for equal pay for equal work for women, will be his legacy. I think it is a great piece of work, and I commend him for what he has done.

But the President's legacy in the eons to come will be that he became President of the United States of America. The mere fact that the Honorable Barack Obama was elected not once, but twice, speaks to our efforts to form a more perfect Union.

I think that his greatest legacy will be his having served as President of the United States of America. That fact alone will be something that we will never, ever erase from history.

I thank you for the opportunity to visit with you, and I pray that the President will be bold and sign the executive order, will lead with the executive order that may lead to comprehensive immigration reform and a pathway to citizenship for those who are living in the shadows of life. God bless you.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas for his very thoughtful and eloquent observations.

I think it is so important that you pointed out the President's place in the context of his legacy relating to his election because I believe that also ties into his legitimacy in moving forward with executive action on immigration.

This is the first Democratic President since FDR to be elected to consecutive terms having secured a majority of the vote from the American people, and so he has all of the legitimacy, all of the electoral mandate to act in a bold fashion.

We know that President George W. Bush came into the Presidency under questionable circumstances. He didn't receive a majority of the vote of the American people, and I am not sure what took place down in Florida, but

certainly, there were significant questions as to the authenticity of the final result.

He came into office under questionable circumstances; yet there was no talk of impeachment, even as he proceeded to get us into not one but two wars and jam a reckless tax cut to benefit the wealthy and the well-off down the throats of the American people.

If you just take Iraq, for example, his administration lied their way into a conflict that has cost the American people thousands of lives, billions of dollars; international legitimacy has been jeopardized. No one from this side of the aisle talked about bringing forth Articles of Impeachment in any meaningful way against George W. Bush.

□ 2000

You have a democratically elected President, Barack Obama, overwhelming electoral college landslide. He has got a mandate to act, and there are some Members on the other side of the aisle who just can't help themselves, who are itching to try and delegitimize this President. Shame on you. Let's just hope that we can move forward in a more productive fashion as it relates to how we interact with the executive branch. The whole world is watching, and they expect us to behave responsibly as we move forward.

Now, in terms of how do we move forward, how do we create a more perfect Union, and how do we act potentially in a bipartisan fashion, I think there are at least four areas where there should be opportunity to find common ground. I think we should be able to find common ground as it relates to immigration reform and dealing with our broken immigration system. We should be able to find common ground as it relates to giving America a raise. We should be able to find common ground as it relates to criminal justice reform.

I have been encouraged as a member of the House Judiciary Committee bipartisan task force on over-criminalization by the willingness of Democrats and Republicans, conservatives and progressives, to try to work together to solve this issue of a broken criminal justice system that we have got in America.

There are areas where we should be able to find some common ground. Let me start by dealing with this question of the executive order on immigration, because there is a lot of hysteria in this town now about how some people in the Congress are going to react to the President if he decides to issue some form of executive order on immigration, as if this President would be doing something extraordinary.

The history, in fact, tells us that since President Eisenhower, every single occupant at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue has issued executive orders related to immigration. In fact, there have been 39 such orders from Eisenhower all the way through to President George W. Bush related to the topic

and subject matter of immigration. In fact, if you look at some of the executive orders that were issued by President Ronald Reagan and President George H.W. Bush related to undocumented immigrants from Central America and the need in their view to try to keep families together, they were some of the broadest executive orders issued by any President in the area of immigration.

Where was the impeachment talk back then? Why are we subjecting this President to such reckless conversations? I thought that we were trying to come together in the aftermath of these elections to see if we can have a productive 114th Congress, because certainly we know that the 113th Congress was or is on track, I should say, to go down as the least productive Congress in the history of the Republic. That is quite a designation. I mean, the least productive Congress?

If we go down memory lane and think about some of the highlights, this is a Congress that brought us a reckless, irresponsible government shutdown that cost the economy \$24 billion in lost economic productivity all because of this clinical obsession with the Affordable Care Act. We flirted with a default on our debt for the first time in our Nation's history, threatening the full faith and credit of the United States of America. It is a Congress that brought us sequestration, \$85 billion in randomly spread out cuts across the government in a way that put hundreds of thousands of jobs in jeopardy. We failed to renew unemployment insurance, leaving millions of Americans on the battlefield of the Great Recession. These are the highlights of the 113th Congress. I don't think that is a record to be proud of as we move forward.

So I think we could all benefit from a reduction in the rhetoric in an effort to try and find common ground. If you don't like what the President may do on the issue of immigration, you are going to control the House of Representatives and you are going to control the Senate. Just act. Do something. Stop talking. Fix our broken immigration system. You have the power to do so.

The Senate acted in a bipartisan fashion last year passing a comprehensive immigration reform bill that was not perfect but certainly was a good faith attempt to try and address the problem. There were 52 Democrats, 2 Independents, and 14 Republicans, if my recollection serves me correctly. They partnered together to pass a bipartisan piece of legislation.

So I am just hopeful that the House will come together and legitimately try to tackle an issue and just stop throwing out the word "amnesty" to apply to everything that you don't like. I mean, in this country's greatest tradition, we have never had dual citizenship, and we shouldn't have dual citizenship moving forward. We should just try to find a way to bring these 11 million undocumented people out of

the shadows in a fashion that independent economists have said will be beneficial to the American taxpayer and result in dramatic reductions in our Nation's deficit. That is immigration reform. I am hopeful we can find some common ground in that area.

The second area where I think we should come together in our march toward a more perfect Union has to do with giving America a raise. Right now, the Federal minimum wage is \$7.25 an hour. In other words, in the wealthiest country in the world, in our great Republic, under that Federal minimum wage, you can have somebody who works full-time, 40 hours a week, 52 weeks a year, and at the end of the day, with a family of three, find themselves below the Federal poverty line. That is the classic definition of "working poor." Why would we cement that into law?

So I think that the responsible thing to do is for us to try to figure out how we can come together and raise the minimum wage. We couldn't get a vote in the House of Representatives on H.R. 1010—this Congress—that would have raised the minimum wage to \$10.10 an hour over the next year or so. Let's hit the refresh button and try to get something done next Congress. And this is not just something that Democrats embrace. This is not simply something that blue States embrace. This is not something that progressives simply embrace. If we are going to take a message from the outcome of the election earlier in November, we can't pick and choose what message we want to take.

How about we draw some lessons from the fact that the voters of Alaska came to the polls and overwhelmingly supported an increase in the minimum wage in that State; the voters in Arkansas came to the polls and overwhelmingly supported an increase in the minimum wage in that State; the voters of Nebraska came to the polls and overwhelmingly supported an increase in the minimum wage in that State; and the voters of South Dakota came to the polls and overwhelmingly supported an increase in the minimum wage in that State. Those are four deeply conservative, deeply red States.

America wants a raise. If we are looking for issues where we can find common ground beyond immigration reform, perhaps we can start there. One of the reasons why I think we should start there is because, if you look at what the minimum wage really means in real terms right now, we are falling behind in terms of where we once were and also in terms of making sure that we are giving the people who are working for the minimum wage a fair shot to pursue the American Dream.

If you were to look at this chart that is before us, you will see that in 1968 only 17 percent of the people who fall or fell into the category of a low-wage worker had some college experience, but in 2012 that number has shot way up: 46 percent of the people falling into

the category of a low-wage worker with some college experience. No wonder there is a lot of anxiety and uncertainty about the future of America amongst the people we represent all across the country when you have got folks with some college experience falling into the category of a low-wage worker.

In 1968, about 48 percent of the people, low-wage workers, had a high school diploma or GED. That number has shot up. In 2012, 79 percent of low-wage workers had completed high school or obtained their GED. Americans are more educated now than we were 45 or so plus years ago in terms of the workforce but earning less. That is a fundamental problem that we have got to confront in this country, and raising the minimum wage is one way in which to do it.

The other thing that we should take a look at related to the minimum wage is the fact that the people who are on it in large measure are actually trying to support themselves on a full-time basis or support their families. One of the most popular myths put forward by those who are determined to do everything possible to stop America from getting a raise like to say, well, people who work for the minimum wage are teenagers, or they work part-time after school and live with their parents. All they are really doing is trying to earn some extra spending money. It is a cute argument, but when you actually evaluate it using some objective factual analysis, you see that these are simply myths designed to undermine the effort to raise the minimum wage for people who are actually struggling to support their families.

□ 2015

Unlike the popular mythology that is put forward that these are teenagers or afterschool workers or people who are trying to get some spending change to go to the movies, the reality is the average age of people who are working for minimum wage numbers in America is 35 years old. Eighty-eight percent of the people working for minimum wage right now are not teenagers, they are 20 years or older. More than a quarter actually have children, and 55 percent of these individuals, as this chart illustrates, work full time. So let's have an evidence-based discussion about the need to increase the minimum wage that is rooted in objective, factual analysis and not hysteria or mythology designed simply to evade the discussion.

And the fact that the minimum wage increase has been embraced by deeply conservative voters in Arkansas and Alaska and Nebraska and South Dakota I think provides us with a starting point to move forward and attempt to find common ground in doing something that makes sense simply for America.

So I have mentioned immigration reform as a possible avenue of trying to identify common ground. I have mentioned the minimum wage. I think we

also have to try to deal with the issue of our broken criminal justice system. If you think about the fact that in America there are more than 2 million people incarcerated in our country, that is a tremendous waste of human capital. It is a tremendous waste of our economic resources and results in a dramatic loss of human productivity.

So I have actually been pleased over the last several years that people on the left and on the right, progressives and conservatives, are finding their way toward common ground to deal with a criminal justice system that clearly is broken, and starting perhaps with the notion that we have had a failed war on drugs that has resulted in putting people behind bars far too often, and disproportionately African Americans and Latino men, but putting nonviolent drug abusers behind bars—a dramatic waste of taxpayer dollars in a manner that has proven to be ineffective from a criminal justice standpoint.

As a member of the bipartisanship task force on overcriminalization chaired by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER)—the Democratic leader of the effort was the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), one of the things that was striking as we moved forward with our exploration was the fact that in the Federal system more than 50 percent of the people who are currently incarcerated—more than 50 percent—are there for drug or substance abuse crimes. Only about 8 percent of the current occupants of Federal prisons across America were convicted of violent crimes. Something is wrong with that picture.

I am thankful, actually, that States, particularly in the deep South, conservative States with Republican Governors and Republican-held State legislative bodies, have recognized the failure of the excessive law and order policies brought to us in the late 1980s and the early 1990s, the fact that it was costing their taxpayers dollars, wasting resources, and they have come together to reform the criminal justice system. It has happened in Texas. It has happened in South Carolina. It has happened in Alabama. It has happened in Kentucky. It has happened in Louisiana. It has happened in Georgia. Again, these aren't blue States. These are not traditionally Democratic States, these are traditionally conservative States recognizing the need for criminal justice reform.

So I am hopeful that as we move into the 114th Congress, we can find our way toward dealing with this issue. We have got Senators from the other side of the aisle who have expressed an interest in tackling this issue. And we have Democratic and Republican members of the House Judiciary Committee and beyond who have indicated a willingness to try to fix our broken criminal justice system: to eradicate mandatory minimums; to restore discretion to judges; to focus less on punishment as

it relates to nonviolent drug abusers; and to provide treatment and rehabilitation so we can help people successfully reenter our society.

We have to finish the job as it relates to the disparity between crack and cocaine. It was 100 to 1. This Congress acted; it is now 18 to 1, but there is still no pharmaceutical reason for there to be any disparity between crack and cocaine. And we should make our reforms retroactive so we can free thousands of people unnecessarily behind bars right now for a law that this Congress has deemed to be unjust. So criminal justice reform, a third area where perhaps we can work together.

And lastly, as we prepare to wind down this Congressional Black Caucus Special Order, I also want to express my thanks to my good friend and colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD) who throughout the last 2 years courageously stood on the floor of the House of Representatives coanchoring the CBC Special Order, and we know that the best is yet to come for Congressman HORSFORD, but the last issue that we have to perhaps tackle in a bipartisan fashion is fixing the damage that was done to the Voting Rights Act by the Supreme Court.

We all should want to encourage Americans to vote and participate in our great democracy. It is that participation that preserves the integrity of the democratic Republic that has been created in this great country. Why anyone would want to suppress the vote is beyond me, with the exception of noting that some view it as a partisan means of maintaining power, a Pyrrhic victory perhaps, because at the end of the day, these efforts to disenfranchise people are bad for America.

This is a chart that illustrates the fact that in the aftermath of the 2010 election, some people interpreted that midterm election as a mandate to suppress the vote. And so in 41 States, 180 voter suppression-type bills were introduced all across America. In every State that is represented with a red color, laws were introduced to suppress the vote. That is how the 2010 elections seem to have been interpreted by some.

I am hopeful that coming out of the 2014 midterm elections that we will actually come together. There is a bill in the House of Representatives—it has Republican support and it has Democratic support—to help Americans who want to vote and undo the damage that was done to the Voting Rights Act by the Supreme Court.

Now, the Voting Rights Act has a great bipartisan history. It was enacted into law in 1965. We are going to celebrate its 50th anniversary next year. It was signed and championed by Lyndon Baines Johnson, with the support of civil rights leaders, Dr. King, and of course our own Congressman JOHN LEWIS. But every time the Voting Rights Act was reauthorized, it was reauthorized by a Republican President. It was reauthorized in 1970, signed into

law by President Richard Nixon. And then it was reauthorized again in 1975, signed into law by President Gerald Ford. And then the Voting Rights Act was reauthorized again in 1982, signed into law by President Ronald Reagan. And then it was reauthorized again in 2006 and signed into law by President George W. Bush. It has a great bipartisan history.

If we are looking for areas where we can find common ground, where there is an opportunity for Democrats and Republicans, for conservatives and progressives to work together, we have got a lot of options. We can fix our broken immigration system. We can deal with criminal justice reform. We can give America a raise, and we can fix the Voting Rights Act on the occasion of our celebrating the 50th anniversary of its passage.

And so I am hopeful that we can put the dysfunction and the obfuscation and the government shutdown and the impeachment talk and the sequestration and the serial flirtation with the debt ceiling and defaulting behind us and come together, find common ground, and march toward a more perfect union in the 114th Congress.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight our Nation's struggle to achieve a more perfect Union. As we look upon the political landscape this fall, it is impossible to ignore the backward steps we have taken.

In years past, elections signaled a time of hope and renewal: Hope that partisan politics would be put aside and renewal of our working relationships across the aisle and across the Capitol.

However, even as election results were being tallied earlier this month the new Republican majority was already highlighting the divisive actions they planned to undertake in the next Congress. Among these plans are efforts to undermine the Affordable Care Act, and to shutdown the federal government or impeach President Obama over his immigration reforms.

Mr. Speaker, I see nothing but divisiveness and partisanship in these plans. In fact, investigations into the creation of the Affordable Care Act or the President's immigration policy do nothing to advance the needs of everyday Americans who continue to struggle making ends meet.

I urge my Republican Colleagues to abandon these frivolous efforts and instead focus on expanding opportunities for every American and creating a more perfect Union.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues of the Congressional Black Caucus to speak to the issues that members of the 113th Congress must address.

I thank my colleagues Representatives STEVEN HORSFORD and HAKEEM JEFFRIES for leading this evening's Congressional Black Caucus Special Order on "The March toward a More Perfect Union: Where Do We Go from Here?"

We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general

Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

These words are powerful and unforgettable—they are the preamble of the Constitution of the United States of America.

What is most striking about these words are the first 3, “We the People.” They remind us that we are here in the “People’s House” to do the people’s business.

The Supreme Courts over the centuries looked to these words for guidance or evidence of what the founding fathers intended for the Constitution’s meaning and its ultimate purpose.

This places the preamble in a unique role as time has separated us from the words and thoughts of those who drafted the document, which governs our form of government today.

The Supreme Court, in its decision in *Ellis v. City of Grand Rapids*, looked to the preamble in reaching its decision in this eminent domain case. The Court decided that the use of land to provide additional land for the expansion of a hospital would be in the interest of the people and should be allowed under the constitution.

We the People, two years ago re-elected President Obama to the Presidency of the United States with 57.5 of all eligible voters voting for him to serve a second term in 2012.

He ran on the issues of retaining the Affordable Health Care Act, infrastructure investments, and rebuilding the middle class.

His re-election was no fluke; it was an affirmation by the people of the United States of a decision they made nearly 4 years earlier when he defeated his Republican opponent and become President.

In 2008, President Obama won 53% of the votes in the election that saw voter turnout at 62.3 percent of eligible citizens voting.

During the hard fought campaign then Democratic Presidential Candidate Obama said that he would focus on health care reform, repairing the economy, which was in shambles, and ending the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and bring our troops home.

Once President Obama entered office in January 2009, he was given the full picture of how bad the economy really was and how much work would be needed to repair the damage and restore economic vitality.

Since 2008, the economy has made tremendous progress, but more work needs to be done and I invite my colleague to commit in earnest to doing the work held to help the people of this nation.

On March 23, 2010, with the stroke of President Obama’s pen, the American people received this part of the “Fair Deal.” This bill did not become law in the dead of night, but in the full process this body affords serious consideration of legislation. There were committee hearings, staff and member meetings, amendments and a final vote in both the House and the Senate before it was sent to the President’s desk.

The Affordable Care Act has been affirmed to be law by every means provided by our nation’s constitution:

On June 28, 2012, the United States Supreme Court upheld the ACA, affirming the constitutionality of the law—leaving intact the majority of the incentives to expand healthcare coverage to millions of Americans.

The Affordable Care Act was a central issue in the Presidential election of 2012. President

Obama who signed the Affordable Care Act into law won the election by 51.1 percent of the popular vote and 62 percent of the electoral vote.

REPUBLICAN VICTORY ON NOVEMBER 4, 2014 WAS NO MANDATE

The voter turnout on November 4 was lowest voter turnout in 72 years according to the *New York Times*. National voter participation was 33.9% for the 2014 mid-term elections.

Although some are trying to call the election a mandate, that argument cannot be made if these same people refused to treat as a mandate the victories of Present Obama in two elections with a vote well over 50% and voter participation of 60% or more.

The Affordable Health Care Act is the law of the land; we have 10 million people with health care, who otherwise would not have the financial security that brings to them and their families.

November 15, 2014–December 15, 2014 is open season for the Affordable Care Act, which allows those without health insurance the opportunity to purchase insurance for themselves and their children.

The Affordable Care Act is not going anywhere and if the Republicans want to use taxpayers dollars on continuing to argue over it that is a waste of precious legislative days that the people of this nation cannot afford.

REPUBLICAN THREATS OF SHUTDOWN OVER IMMIGRATION REFORM

The Republicans shut down the government a year ago in October and the consequences were devastating to the American workers and seriously damaged the financial recovery the nation was experiencing.

The Shutdown of 2011 cost the nation \$24 billion.

A CNN poll found that 69 percent of Americans—including 52 percent of Tea Party supporters—thought the Congressional Republicans were “acting like spoiled children,” and 46 percent said they would blame Congressional Republicans for a shutdown.

Sixty-eight percent of the American public said the shutdown of a few days would be a bad thing for the country; that number rose to nearly 80 percent for a shutdown lasting a few weeks.

Sixty percent say it is more important for Congress to avoid a shutdown than to make major changes to the new health care law. [9/30]

According to the Office of Management and Budget, the last Republican Government Shutdown hurt the American people.

Hundreds of thousands of federal employees immediately and indefinitely furloughed, and many Federal employees and contractors that continued to work were not paid during the shutdown.

Housing loans to low and middle income families in rural communities were put on hold, as would start-up business loans for farmers and ranchers.

SBA stopped approving applications for small businesses to obtain loans and loan guarantees. In a typical month, SBA approves over \$1 billion in loan assistance to small businesses.

All facilities and services in our national parks were closed, along with the Smithsonian, impacting the hundreds of thousands of people that were on or heading to vacations. This had a severe negative impact on the surrounding local communities that rely on the

revenue generated by travel and tourism to these destinations.

Important government research into life-threatening diseases, environmental protection, and other areas were halted.

The government stopped issuing permits to conduct drilling operations on Federal lands, and would stop or delay environmental reviews of planned transportation and energy-related projects, keeping companies from working on these projects.

Hundreds of thousands of federal employees suddenly did not have a pay-check coming and had no idea when the shutdown would end.

Veterans were left without access to vital services.

It was irresponsible then and it would be far worse knowing what the reality was then for this Congress to do this to the American people again in less than 2 years.

IMMIGRATION REFORM LONG OVERDUE

The immigration reform bill that came out of the Senate does much to improve family immigration, but I am concerned that the bill contains some fundamental changes to our immigration system that move us away from the principle of family reunification.

In my role as a Senior Member of both the House Judiciary Immigration Subcommittee and Homeland Security Committee, I will continue working to strengthen the provisions in the bill that impact families and work to restore other important provisions which help families, particularly those immigrants of limited means—every immigrant cannot be a millionaire tech entrepreneur or bear the lineage of some landed gentry—America is the ultimate egalitarian society where opportunity waits for those rich and poor who seek it.

Nearly everyone agrees that our immigration system is badly broken and in dire need of fixing, and the bill that came out of the Senate is a step in the right direction.

What we need is immigration legislation that establishes a path to citizenship for the 11 million undocumented immigrants in this country. We must address the lengthy backlogs in our current immigration system—backlogs that have kept families apart sometimes for decades.

We must grant a faster track to the ‘Dreamers’ brought to this country as children through no fault of their own, and to agricultural workers who are an essential part of our communities and work so hard to provide our nation’s food supply.

We need immigration legislation that will make important changes to the visas used by dairy farmers and the tourism industry and by immigrant investors who are making investments in our communities.

Dreamers grew up in the United States, but were brought here illegally through no fault of their own. Nearly 300,000 Dreamers have been granted legal status in the past year, giving them the ability to live their lives in our communities by working and going to college without fear of deportation.

Most Americans agree that we need a comprehensive immigration reform plan that includes a pathway to citizenship. Nearly 9 out of 10 Americans (87%) believe that it would be better to offer undocumented workers an opportunity to earn citizenship after they have met the necessary requirements than to deport them.

If the House had seriously considered comprehensive immigration reform it would not be

necessary for the President to use his legitimate and lawful Executive authority by the end of this year to minimize the damage caused by Congress' failure to act.

Providing legal status to the undocumented immigrants currently in our country would grow our GDP by a cumulative increase of \$832 billion over 10 years. According to the Center for American Progress, immigration reform would create 121,000 new jobs each year in the next decade. Legalization would increase immigrants' income, an additional boost to our economy.

We must also do something to protect our borders. I am an original cosponsor of H.R. 1417—the Border Security Results Act of 2013. This bill has received accolades from the Wall Street Journal and The Los Angeles Times as a commonsense approach to protect our borders.

I believe the border security legislation that we put forward can be the solution that allows real immigration reform to move forward because it will provide the security at the border that the American people are demanding and deserve.

The Border Security Results Act would require a comprehensive outcome-based strategy that includes deployment of more surveillance technology for gaining full situational awareness of the border, use of that data to allocate manpower and other resources along the border and the creation of metrics to set progress in achieving border security. Those metrics may be based on the number of apprehensions of illegal aliens relative to the number of illegal crossings.

Over the years I have introduced the Save America Comprehensive Immigration Act and much of the Senate passed bill was included in my immigration bill; the Senate bill would address some of the toughest issues on immigration reform and would offer many innovative and considerate solutions that will help to repair some of the most broken parts of our immigration system.

So the passage of the Senate bill is a major leap forward in human rights in America. Now is the time for the House of Representatives to continue this crucial fight for immigration reform and a secure America.

If we let the immigration reform debate focus primarily on minute elements we lose sight of the broader picture—many other important things we need to do to fix our broken immigration system. It has been estimated that approximately 11 million undocumented immigrants live in the United States.

The vast majority of them are hard-working and law-abiding persons who have become productive members of our society. It serves no purpose to keep them in the shadows of our society praying for lawful status. It is not good for them, and is not in the best interests of the United States. Comprehensive immigration reform will require leadership from the Administration, the Senate, both parties in Congress with a willingness on everyone's part to work together.

The American people will hold accountable those that stand in the way of making comprehensive immigration reform.

When the House and the Senate passes comprehensive immigration reform the President will sign it into law. This is something that would be permanent and provide the stability America needs as we move toward a more prosperous future.

This special order is an opportunity to make the case for continuing on the course set by the Obama Administration and the need to not

take the recent election as a mandate for major changes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1086) "An Act to reauthorize and improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 110-315, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, announces the appointment of the following individual to be a member of the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity:

Dr. Paul LeBlanc of New Hampshire, vice Larry Vanderhoef of California.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GARRETT (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY of California) for today on account of attending a funeral.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of a flight delay due to weather conditions.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2015, AND THE 10-YEAR PERIOD FY 2015 THROUGH FY 2024

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, November 17, 2014.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin: Mr. Speaker, to facilitate application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, I am transmitting an updated status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal years 2014, 2015, and for the 10-year period of fiscal year 2015 through fiscal year 2024. The report is current through November 12, 2014. The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature.

Table 1 in the report compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues for fiscal years 2014, 2015, and the 10-year period of fiscal year 2015 through 2024 to the overall limits filed in the Congressional Record on January 27, 2014 for fiscal year 2014 and on April 29, 2014 for fiscal years 2015 and 2015–2024 as required by the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013. This comparison is needed to implement section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2015 because appropriations for those years have not yet been considered.

Table 2 compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for action completed by each authorizing committee with the "section 302(a)" allocations filed on January 27, 2014 for fiscal year 2014 and the allocations filed on April 29, 2014 for fiscal years 2015 and the 10-year period 2015 through 2024 as required by the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013. For fiscal year 2014, "action" refers to

legislation enacted after the adoption of the levels set forth on January 27, 2014. For fiscal years 2015 and the 10-year period 2015–2024, "action" refers to legislation enacted after the adoption of the levels set forth on April 29, 2014.

This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

Tables 3 and 4 compare the current status of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2014 and 2015 with the "section 302(b)" sub-allocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. The comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act because the point of order under that section equally applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) sub-allocation. The table also provides supplementary information on spending in excess of the base discretionary spending caps allowed under section 251(b) of the Budget Control Act.

Tables 5 and 6 give the current level for fiscal year 2015 and 2016, respectively, of accounts identified for advance appropriations under section 601 of H. Con. Res. 25. This list is needed to enforce section 601 of the budget resolution, which creates a point of order against appropriation bills that contain advance appropriations that are: (i) not identified in the statement of managers or (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in the resolution.

In addition, letters from the Congressional Budget Office are attached that summarize and compare the budget impact of enacted legislation that occurred after adoption of the budget resolution against the budget resolution aggregates in force.

If you have any questions, please contact Paul Restuccia at (202) 226-7270.

Sincerely,

PAUL RYAN,
Chairman.

TABLE 1—REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2014 AND 2015 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET AS PROVIDED FOR BY THE BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2013

(Reflecting action completed as of November 12, 2014—On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

| | Fiscal Year 2014 ¹ | Fiscal Year 2015 ² | Fiscal Years 2015–2024 |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Appropriate Level: | | | |
| Budget Authority | 2,924,837 | 3,031,744 | n.a. |
| Outlays | 2,937,044 | 3,026,369 | n.a. |
| Revenues | 2,311,026 | 2,535,978 | 31,206,399 |
| Current Level: | | | |
| Budget Authority | 2,943,968 | 3,037,383 | n.a. |
| Outlays | 2,955,423 | 3,041,694 | n.a. |
| Revenues | 2,311,761 | 2,535,984 | 31,206,465 |
| Current Level over (+) / under (–) Appropriate Level: | | | |
| Budget Authority | +19,131 | +5,639 | n.a. |
| Outlays | +18,379 | +15,325 | n.a. |
| Revenues | +735 | +6 | +66 |

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2016 through 2024 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

¹ Section 111(b) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 required the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget in the House of Representatives to file aggregate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2014 for purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. The spending and revenue aggregates for fiscal year 2014 were subsequently filed on January 27, 2014. The current level for this report begins with the budgetary levels filed on January 27, 2014 and makes changes to those levels for enacted legislation.

²Section 115(b) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 (BBA) required the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget in the House of Representatives to file aggregate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2015 and for fiscal years 2015–2024 for purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. The spending and revenue aggregates for fiscal year 2015 were filed on April 29, 2014. Those levels were subsequently adjusted on November 12, 2014 pursuant to BBA section 115(e) to reflect the budgetary effects of deficit reduction enacted in the Highways and Transportation Funding Act of 2014. The current level for this report begins with the budgetary levels filed on April 29, 2014 as adjusted, and makes changes to those levels for enacted legislation.

TABLE 2—DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR RESOLUTION CHANGES

[Reflecting action completed as of November 12, 2014—Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

| House Committee | 2014 | | 2015 | | 2015–2024 | |
|------------------------------------|--------|---------|------|---------|-----------|---------|
| | BA | Outlays | BA | Outlays | BA | Outlays |
| Agriculture: | | | | | | |
| Allocation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Current Level | +3,243 | +2,124 | 0 | 0 | –19 | –19 |
| Difference | +3,243 | +2,124 | 0 | 0 | –19 | –19 |
| Armed Services: | | | | | | |
| Allocation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Current Level | +4 | +4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Difference | +4 | +4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Education and the Workforce: | | | | | | |
| Allocation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Current Level | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Difference | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Energy and Commerce: | | | | | | |
| Allocation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Current Level | +6,159 | +6,157 | +2 | +2 | +24 | +24 |
| Difference | +6,159 | +6,157 | +2 | +2 | +24 | +24 |
| Financial Services: | | | | | | |
| Allocation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Current Level | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Difference | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Foreign Affairs: | | | | | | |
| Allocation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Current Level | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Difference | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Homeland Security: | | | | | | |
| Allocation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Current Level | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Difference | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| House Administration: | | | | | | |
| Allocation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Current Level | –34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Difference | –34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Judiciary: | | | | | | |
| Allocation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Current Level | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Difference | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Natural Resources: | | | | | | |
| Allocation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Current Level | –1 | –1 | 0 | –2 | 0 | 0 |
| Difference | –1 | –1 | 0 | –2 | 0 | 0 |
| Oversight and Government Reform: | | | | | | |
| Allocation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Current Level | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Difference | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Science, Space and Technology: | | | | | | |
| Allocation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Current Level | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Difference | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Small Business: | | | | | | |
| Allocation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Current Level | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Difference | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Transportation and Infrastructure: | | | | | | |
| Allocation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Current Level | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Difference | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Veterans' Affairs: | | | | | | |
| Allocation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Current Level | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | –1 | –1 |
| Difference | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | –1 | –1 |
| Ways and Means: | | | | | | |
| Allocation | 0 | 0 | 0 | –15 | –3,542 | –4,777 |
| Current Level | +9,760 | +9,745 | +25 | +20 | –3,519 | –4,739 |
| Difference | +9,760 | +9,745 | +25 | +35 | +23 | +38 |

TABLE 3—DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014—COMPARISON OF CURRENT STATUS WITH APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION AND APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUB ALLOCATIONS AS OF NOVEMBER 12, 2014

[Figures in millions]¹

| | 302(b) Allocations ¹ | | 302(b) for GWOT ¹ | | Current Status General Purpose | | Current Status GWOT | | General Purpose less 302(b) | | GWOT less 302(b) | |
|---------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------|---------------------------------|------|-----------------------------------|-----------|------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|------|---------------------|------|
| | BA | OT | BA | OT | BA | OT | BA | OT | BA | OT | BA | OT |
| Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | 20,880 | 22,092 | 0 | 0 | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. |
| Commerce, Justice, Science | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | 51,600 | 60,756 | 0 | 0 | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. |
| Defense | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | 486,851 | 528,707 | 85,191 | 43,140 | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. |
| Energy and Water Development | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | 34,060 | 39,652 | 0 | 0 | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. |
| Financial Services and General Government | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | 21,851 | 23,054 | 0 | 0 | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. |
| Homeland Security | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | 39,270 | 46,045 | 227 | 182 | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. |
| Interior, Environment | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | 30,058 | 32,154 | 0 | 0 | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. |
| Labor, Health and Human Services, Education | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | 156,773 | 159,953 | 0 | 0 | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. |
| Legislative Branch | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | 4,258 | 4,192 | 0 | 0 | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. |
| Military Construction and Veterans Affairs | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | 73,299 | 76,278 | 0 | 0 | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. |
| State, Foreign Operations | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | 42,481 | 45,818 | 6,520 | 1,885 | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. |
| Transportation, HUD | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | 50,856 | 116,465 | 0 | 0 | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. |
| Full Committee Allowance | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. |
| Total | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | 1,012,237 | 1,155,166 | 91,938 | 45,207 | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. |

Comparison of Total Appropriations and 302(a) Allocation²

| | General Purpose | | GWOT | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------|------------------------|--------|
| | BA | OT | BA | OT |
| 302(a) Allocation | 1,012,237 | 1,154,816 | 91,938 | 45,207 |
| Total Appropriations | 1,012,237 | 1,155,166 | 91,938 | 45,207 |
| Total Appropriations vs. 302(a) Allocation | 0 | +350 | 0 | 0 |
| Memorandum | | | | |
| Spending in Excess of Base Budget Control Act Caps for Sec. 251(b) Designated Categories | Amounts Assumed in 302(b) ¹ | | Emergency Requirements | |
| | BA | OT | BA | OT |
| Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA | n.a. | n.a. | 0 | 0 |
| Commerce, Justice, Science | n.a. | n.a. | 0 | 0 |
| Defense | n.a. | n.a. | 225 | 150 |
| Energy and Water Development | n.a. | n.a. | 0 | 0 |
| Financial Services and General Government | n.a. | n.a. | 0 | 0 |
| Homeland Security | n.a. | n.a. | 0 | 0 |
| Interior, Environment | n.a. | n.a. | 0 | 0 |
| Labor, Health and Human Services, Education | n.a. | n.a. | 0 | 0 |
| Legislative Branch | n.a. | n.a. | 0 | 0 |
| Military Construction and Veterans Affairs | n.a. | n.a. | 0 | 0 |
| State, Foreign Operations | n.a. | n.a. | 0 | 0 |
| Transportation, HUD | n.a. | n.a. | 0 | 0 |
| Totals | n.a. | n.a. | 225 | 150 |

¹ The original 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Appropriations contained in H.Rpt. 113–17 for the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget-Fiscal Year 2014 (H.Con.Res. 25) was revised on January 14, 2014, consistent with section 101 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013. The House Committee on Appropriations did not file revised 302(b) allocations after the final 302(a) allocation was provided—hence there are no valid 302(b)'s in force for fiscal year 2014.

² Spending designated as emergency is not included in the current status of appropriations shown above.

TABLE 4—DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015—COMPARISON OF CURRENT STATUS WITH APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION AND APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUB ALLOCATIONS AS OF NOVEMBER 12, 2014

[Figures in Millions]¹

| | 302(b) Allocations | | 302(b) for GWOT | | Current Status General Purpose ¹ | | Current Status GWOT | | General Purpose less 302(b) | | GWOT less 302(b) | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|--------|------------------------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|-----------|----------------------|--------|
| | BA | OT | BA | OT | BA | OT | BA | OT | BA | OT | BA | OT |
| Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA | 20,880 | 21,716 | 0 | 0 | 20,880 | 21,716 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Commerce, Justice, Science | 51,200 | 61,518 | 0 | 0 | 51,200 | 61,518 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Defense | 490,944 | 522,774 | 79,445 | 36,839 | 490,908 | 522,751 | 79,445 | 36,839 | –36 | –23 | 0 | 0 |
| Energy and Water Development | 34,010 | 37,831 | 0 | 0 | 33,991 | 37,811 | 0 | 0 | –19 | –20 | 0 | 0 |
| Financial Services and General Government | 21,285 | 22,750 | 0 | 0 | 20,133 | 21,593 | 0 | 0 | –1,152 | –1,157 | 0 | 0 |
| Homeland Security | 45,658 | 44,712 | 0 | 0 | 45,658 | 44,712 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Interior, Environment | 30,220 | 30,191 | 0 | 0 | 30,220 | 32,740 | 0 | 0 | 0 | +2,549 | 0 | 0 |
| Labor, Health and Human Services, Education | 155,702 | 159,922 | 0 | 0 | 20,230 | 115,274 | 0 | 0 | –135,472 | –44,648 | 0 | 0 |
| Legislative Branch | 4,258 | 4,219 | 0 | 0 | 3,323 | 3,491 | 0 | 0 | –935 | –728 | 0 | 0 |
| Military Construction and Veterans Affairs | 71,499 | 76,100 | 0 | 0 | 71,499 | 76,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| State, Foreign Operations | 42,381 | 42,319 | 5,912 | 3,142 | 42,137 | 43,653 | 5,912 | 1,275 | –244 | +1,334 | 0 | –1,867 |
| Transportation, HUD | 52,029 | 118,732 | 0 | 0 | 52,029 | 118,678 | 0 | 0 | 0 | –54 | 0 | 0 |
| Full Committee Allowance | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. |
| Total | 1,020,066 | 1,142,784 | 85,357 | 39,981 | 882,208 | 1,100,037 | 85,357 | 38,114 | –137,858 | –42,747 | 0 | –1,867 |
| Comparison of Total Appropriations and 302(a) allocation | | | | | | | | | General Purpose | | GWOT | |
| | | | | | | | | | BA | OT | BA | OT |
| 302(a) Allocation | | | | | | | | | 1,020,066 | 1,142,784 | 85,357 | 39,981 |
| Total Appropriations | | | | | | | | | 882,208 | 1,100,037 | 85,357 | 38,114 |
| Total Appropriations vs. 302(a) Allocation | | | | | | | | | –137,858 | –42,747 | 0 | –1,867 |
| Memorandum | | | | | Amounts Assumed in 302(b) | | Emergency Requirements | | Disaster Funding | | Program Integrity | |
| Spending in Excess of Base Budget Control Act Caps for Sec. 251(b) Designated Categories | | | | | BA | OT | BA | OT | BA | OT | BA | OT |
| Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Commerce, Justice, Science | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Defense | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Energy and Water Development | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Financial Services and General Government | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Homeland Security | | | | | 6,438 | 322 | 0 | 0 | 6,438 | 322 | 0 | 0 |
| Interior, Environment | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Labor, Health and Human Services, Education | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Legislative Branch | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Military Construction and Veterans Affairs | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| State, Foreign Operations | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Transportation, HUD | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Totals | | | | | 6,438 | 322 | 0 | 75 | 6,438 | 322 | 0 | |

¹ Spending designated as emergency is not included in the current status of appropriations shown in this table.

TABLE 5—CURRENT LEVEL OF 2015 ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO H. CON. RES. 25 AS OF NOVEMBER 12, 2014

[Budget Authority in Millions]

| Section 601(d)(1) Limits | | 2,015 |
|----------------------------------------------------|--------|-------|
| Appropriate Level | 55,634 | |
| Enacted Advances: | | |
| Accounts Identified for Advances: | | |
| Department of Veterans Affairs: | | |
| Medical Services | 45,016 | |
| Medical Support and Compliance | 5,880 | |
| Medical Facilities | 4,739 | |
| Subtotal, enacted advances ¹ | 55,635 | |
| Enacted Advances vs. Section 601(d)(1) Limit | +1 | |
| Section 601(d)(2) Limits | | 2015 |
| Appropriate Level | 28,852 | |
| Enacted Advances: | | |
| Accounts Identified for Advances: | | |
| Payment to Postal Service | 71 | |

TABLE 5—CURRENT LEVEL OF 2015 ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO H. CON. RES. 25 AS OF NOVEMBER 12, 2014—Continued

[Budget Authority in Millions]

| Section 601(d)(1) Limits | | 2,015 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|--------|-------|
| Employment and Training Administration | 1,772 | |
| Education for the Disadvantaged | 10,841 | |
| School Improvement Programs | 1,681 | |
| Special Education | 9,283 | |
| Career, Technical and Adult Education | 791 | |
| Tenant-based Rental Assistance | 4,000 | |
| Project-based Rental Assistance | 400 | |
| Subtotal, enacted advances ¹ | 28,839 | |
| Enacted Advances vs. Section 601(d)(2) Limit | –13 | |
| Previously Enacted Advance Appropriations ² | 2,015 | |
| Corporation for Public Broadcasting | 445 | |
| Total, enacted advances ¹ | 84,919 | |

¹ Line items may not add to total due to rounding.

² Funds were appropriated in Public Law 113–6.

TABLE 6—CURRENT LEVEL OF 2016 ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 115(c) OF THE BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2013 AS OF NOVEMBER 12, 2014

[Budget Authority]

| Section 601(d)(1) Limits | | 2,016 |
|----------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-------|
| Appropriate Level | 58,662,202,000 | |
| Enacted Advances: | | |
| Accounts Identified for Advances: | | |
| Department of Veterans Affairs: | | |
| Medical Services | 0 | |
| Medical Support and Compliance | 0 | |
| Medical Facilities | 0 | |
| Subtotal, enacted advances ¹ | 0 | |
| Enacted Advances vs. Section 601(d)(1) Limit | –58,662,202,000 | |
| Section 601(d)(2) Limits | | 2016 |
| Appropriate Level | 28,781,000,000 | |

TABLE 6—CURRENT LEVEL OF 2016 ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 115(c) OF THE BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2013 AS OF NOVEMBER 12, 2014—Continued

| (Budget Authority) | |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Section 601(d)(1) Limits | 2,016 |
| Enacted Advances: | |
| Accounts Identified for Advances: | |
| Employment and Training Administration | 0 |
| Education for the Disadvantaged | 0 |
| School Improvement Programs | 0 |
| Special Education | 0 |
| Career, Technical and Adult Education | 0 |
| Tenant-based Rental Assistance | 0 |
| Project-based Rental Assistance | 0 |
| Subtotal, enacted advances ¹ | 0 |
| Enacted Advances vs. Section 601(d)(2) Limit | —28,781,000,000 |
| Previously Enacted Advance Appropriations | 2,016 |
| Corporation for Public Broadcasting ² | 445,000,000 |

TABLE 6—CURRENT LEVEL OF 2016 ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 115(c) OF THE BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2013 AS OF NOVEMBER 12, 2014—Continued

| (Budget Authority) | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| Section 601(d)(1) Limits | 2,016 |
| Total, enacted advances ¹ | 445,000,000 |
| ¹ Line items may not add to total due to rounding. | |
| ² Funds were appropriated in Public Law 113–76. | |
| U.S. CONGRESS, | |
| CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE, | |
| Washington, DC, November 14, 2014. | |
| Hon. PAUL RYAN, | |
| Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, Washington, DC. | |
| DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2014 budget and is current | |

through November 12, 2014. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H. Con. Res. 25, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2014, as approved by the House of Representatives and subsequently revised.

Since my last letter dated September 9, 2014, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the following act that affects budget authority for fiscal year 2014: Preventing Sex Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act (Public Law 113–183).

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS W. ELMENDORF.

Enclosure.

FISCAL YEAR 2014 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT THROUGH NOVEMBER 12, 2014

(In millions of dollars)

| | Budget Authority | Outlays | Revenues |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|-----------|------------|
| Previously Enacted ^a | | | |
| Revenues | n.a. | n.a. | 2,310,972 |
| Permanents and other spending legislation ^b | 1,849,079 | 1,778,854 | n.a. |
| Appropriation legislation | 0 | 504,662 | n.a. |
| Offsetting receipts | –707,692 | –707,792 | n.a. |
| Total, Previously enacted | 1,141,387 | 1,575,724 | 2,310,972 |
| Enacted Legislation: ^c | | | |
| Authorizing Legislation: | | | |
| Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act of 2013 (P.L. 113–28) | 14,400 | 12,670 | 0 |
| Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2013 (P.L. 113–37) | –1 | –1 | 0 |
| Helium Stewardship Act of 2013 (P.L. 113–40) | –16 | –58 | 0 |
| An act to extend the period during which Iraqis who were employed by the United States Government in Iraq may be granted special immigrant status and to temporarily increase the fee or surcharge for processing machine-readable nonimmigrant visas (P.L. 113–42) | 2 | 2 | 5 |
| National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (P.L. 113–66) | 66 | 68 | 0 |
| Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013/Pathway for SGR Reform Act of 2013 (P.L. 113–67) | –3,207 | 985 | 49 |
| Agricultural Act of 2014 (P.L. 113–79) | 3,243 | 2,124 | 5 |
| Protecting Access to Medicare Act of 2014 (P.L. 113–93) | 6,143 | 6,141 | 0 |
| Gabriella Miller Kids First Research Act (P.L. 113–94) | –34 | 0 | 0 |
| Cooperative and Small Employer Charity Pension Flexibility Act (P.L. 113–97) | –1 | 0 | 5 |
| An act to amend . . . the Provo River Project Transfer Act . . . and for other purposes (P.L. 113–129) | 0 | –1 | 0 |
| Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014 (P.L. 113–159) | 9,765 | 9,765 | 725 |
| Preventing Sex Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act (P.L. 113–183) | 15 | 0 | 0 |
| Total, Authorizing Legislation | 30,375 | 31,695 | 789 |
| Appropriations Legislation: | | | |
| Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014 (P.L. 113–46) ^d | 635 | 635 | 0 |
| Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (P.L. 113–76) | 1,869,637 | 1,421,565 | 0 |
| Support for Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of Ukraine Act of 2014 (P.L. 113–95) | 0 | 350 | 0 |
| Total, Appropriations Legislation | 1,870,272 | 1,422,550 | 0 |
| Total, Enacted Legislation | 1,900,647 | 1,454,245 | 789 |
| Entitlements and Mandatories: | | | |
| Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs | –98,066 | –74,546 | 0 |
| Total Current Level ^e | 2,943,968 | 2,955,423 | 2,311,761 |
| Total House Resolution ^f | 2,924,837 | 2,937,044 | 2,311,026 |
| Current Level Over House Resolution | 19,131 | 18,379 | 735 |
| Current Level Under House Resolution | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. |
| Memorandum: | | | |
| Revenues, 2014–2023: | | | |
| House Current Level | n.a. | n.a. | 31,104,656 |
| House Resolution ^g | n.a. | n.a. | 31,095,742 |
| Current Level Over House Resolution | n.a. | n.a. | 8,914 |
| Current Level Under House Resolution | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. |

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Note: n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

^a Includes the following acts that affect budget authority, outlays, or revenues, and were cleared by the Congress during last session, but before adoption of the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2014 (H. Con. Res. 25): an act to temporarily increase the borrowing authority of the FEMA for carrying out the National Flood Insurance Program (P.L. 113–1), the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (P.L. 113–2), the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Reauthorization Act of 2013 (P.L. 113–5), the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (P.L. 113–6), and the Reducing Flight Delays Act of 2013 (P.L. 113–9).

^b Relative to the House Current Level Report dated October 24, 2013, House Current Level has increased by \$361 million in 2014 because of assumptions related to the interest on the public debt that were revised pursuant to the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 (P.L. 113–67).

^c Pursuant to section 314(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, amounts designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall not count for purposes of Title III and Title IV of the Congressional Budget Act. The amounts so designated for 2014, which are not included in the current level totals, are as follows:

| | Budget Authority | Outlays | Revenues |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|---------|----------|
| Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014 (Sec. 155) | 0 | 50 | 0 |
| Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Resolution, 2014 (P.L. 113–145) | 225 | 150 | 0 |
| Veterans' Access to Care through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act of 2014 (P.L. 113–146) | 15,000 | 450 | 0 |
| Total, amounts designated as emergency requirements | 15,225 | 650 | 0 |

^d Sections 135 and 136 of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014 (P.L. 113–46) provide \$636 million for fire suppression activities, available until expended. Section 146 of the act freezes the pay of Members of Congress, which is estimated to result in a reduction in spending of \$1 million in 2014.

^e For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the House, the resolution, as approved by the House of Representatives, does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, current level does not include these items.

^f Periodically, the House Committee on the Budget revises the totals in H. Con. Res. 25, pursuant to various provisions of the resolution:

| | Budget Authority | Outlays | Revenues |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Original House Resolution | 2,769,406 | 2,815,079 | 2,270,932 |
| Revisions: | | | |
| Pursuant to section 603 of H. Con. Res. 25 | –14,089 | –4,100 | 40,040 |
| Adjustment for Disaster Designated Spending | 6,079 | 230 | 0 |
| Adjustment for Technical Correction to the Budget Control Act Spending Caps | 549 | 308 | 0 |
| Pursuant to section 111 of the Bipartisan Budget Act | 162,892 | 125,527 | 54 |
| Revised House Resolution | 2,924,837 | 2,937,044 | 2,311,026 |

^g Periodically, the House Committee on the Budget revises the 2014–2023 revenue totals in H. Con. Res. 25, pursuant to various provisions of the resolution. The total shown in the table reflects those revisions.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, November 14, 2014.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of
Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2015 budget and is current through November 12, 2014. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of

section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels printed in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2014, pursuant to section 115 of the Bipartisan Budget Act (Public Law 113-67).

Since my last letter dated September 9, 2014, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the following acts that affect

budget authority or outlays for fiscal year 2015:

Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2015 (Public Law 113-164);

Preventing Sex Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act (Public Law 113-183); and
IMPACT Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-185).

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS W. ELMENDORF.

Enclosure.

FISCAL YEAR 2015 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT THROUGH NOVEMBER 12, 2014

[In millions of dollars]

| | Budget Authority | Outlays | Revenues |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|------------|
| Previously Enacted: ^a | | | |
| Revenues | n.a. | n.a. | 2,533,388 |
| Permanents and other spending legislation | 1,882,631 | 1,805,294 | n.a. |
| Appropriation legislation | 0 | 508,261 | n.a. |
| Offsetting receipts | -735,195 | -734,481 | n.a. |
| Total, Previously Enacted | 1,147,436 | 1,579,074 | 2,533,388 |
| Enacted Legislation: ^b | | | |
| Lake Hill Administrative Site Affordable Housing Act (P.L. 113-141) | 0 | -2 | 0 |
| Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014 (P.L. 113-159) | 0 | -15 | 2,590 |
| Emergency Afghan Allies Extension Act of 2014 (P.L. 113-160) | 5 | 5 | 6 |
| Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2015 (P.L. 113-164) ^c | -4,705 | -180 | 0 |
| Preventing Sex Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act (P.L. 113-183) | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| IMPACT Act of 2014 (P.L. 113-185) | 22 | 22 | 0 |
| Total, Enacted Legislation | -4,678 | -160 | 2,596 |
| Continuing Resolution: ^c | | | |
| Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2015 (P.L. 113-164) | 1,027,857 | 611,709 | 0 |
| Entitlements and Mandatories: | | | |
| Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs | 866,768 | 851,071 | 0 |
| Total Current Level ^d | 3,037,383 | 3,041,694 | 2,535,984 |
| Total House Resolution ^e | 3,031,744 | 3,026,369 | 2,535,978 |
| Current Level Over House Resolution | 5,639 | 15,325 | 6 |
| Current Level Under House Resolution | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. |
| Memorandum: | | | |
| Revenues, 2015-2024: | | | |
| House Current Level | n.a. | n.a. | 31,206,465 |
| House Resolution ^f | n.a. | n.a. | 31,206,399 |
| Current Level Over House Resolution | n.a. | n.a. | 66 |
| Current Level Under House Resolution | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. |

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Note: n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

^a Includes the following acts that affect budget authority, outlays, or revenues, and were cleared by the Congress during this session, but before publication in the Congressional Record of the statement of the allocations and aggregates pursuant to section 115 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 (P.L. 113-67): the Agricultural Act of 2014 (P.L. 113-79), the Homeowner Food Insurance Affordability Act of 2014 (P.L. 113-89), the Gabriella Miller Kids First Research Act (P.L. 113-94), and the Cooperative and Small Employer Charity Pension Flexibility Act (P.L. 113-97).

^b Pursuant to section 314(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, amounts designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall not count for purposes of Title III and Title IV of the Congressional Budget Act. The amounts so designated for 2015, which are not included in the current level totals, are as follows:

| | Budget Authority | Outlays | Revenues |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|---------|----------|
| Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Resolution, 2014 | 0 | 75 | 0 |
| Veterans' Access to Care through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act of 2014 (P.L. 113-146) | -1,331 | 6,619 | -42 |
| Total, amounts designated as emergency requirements | -1,331 | 6,694 | -42 |

^c The Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 (P.L. 113-146) provides funding through December 11, 2014. Sections 136 and 137 provide \$88 million to respond to the Ebola virus, which is available until September 30, 2015. Section 139 rescinds funds from the Children's Health Insurance Program. Section 147 extends the authorization for the Export-Import Bank of the United States through June 30, 2015. The amounts for sections 136, 137, 139 and 147 are shown in the "Enacted Legislation" portion of this table.

^d For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the House, the resolution, as approved by the House of Representatives, does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, current level does not include these items.

^e Periodically, the House Committee on the Budget revises the budgetary levels printed in the Congressional Record on April, 29, 2014, pursuant to section 115 of the Bipartisan Budget Act (Public Law 113-67):

| | Budget Authority | Outlays | Revenues |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Original House Resolution | 3,025,306 | 3,025,032 | 2,533,388 |
| Revisions: | | | |
| Adjustment for Disaster Designated Spending | 6,438 | 322 | 0 |
| Pursuant to section 115(e) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 | 0 | 1,030 | 0 |
| Adjustment for the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014 | 0 | -15 | 2,590 |
| Revised House Resolution | 3,031,744 | 3,026,369 | 2,535,978 |

^f Periodically, the House Committee on the Budget revises the 2015-2024 revenue totals printed in the Congressional Record on April, 29, 2014 pursuant to section 115 of the Bipartisan Budget Act (Public Law 113-67).

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on September 16, 2014, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following joint resolution:

H.J. Res. 120 Approving the location of a memorial to commemorate the more than 5,000 slaves and free Black persons who fought for independence in the American Revolution.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 18, 2014, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7719. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Defense Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Deletion of Text Implementing 10 U.S.C. 2323 (DFARS Case 2011-D038) (RIN: 0750-AH45) received October 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7720. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-77; Introduction [Docket No.: FAR 2014-0051, Sequence 5] received October 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7721. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-77; Small Entity Compliance Guide [Docket No.: FAR 2014-0052; Sequence No. 5] received October 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7722. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Priority; Rehabilitation Training: Rehabilitation Long-Term Training Program — Rehabilitation Specialty Areas [Docket ID: ED-2014-OSERS-0068] received November 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7723. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Priority; Technical Assistance on State Data Collection — IDEA Data Management Center [CFDA Number: 84.373M.] received November 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7724. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Priority; Rehabilitation Services Administration — Assistive Technology Alternative Financing Program [CFDA Number: 84.224D.] received November 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7725. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Priorities; Rehabilitation Services Administration — Capacity Building Program for Traditionally Underserved Populations — Vocational Rehabilitation Training Institute for the Preparation of Personnel in American Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Services Projects [Docket ID: ED-2014-OSERS-0024; CFDA Number: 84.315C.] received November 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7726. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Priority; Technical Assistance on State Data Collection — IDEA Fiscal Data Center received November 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7727. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Violence Against Women Act [Docket ID: ED-2013-OPE-0124] (RIN: 1840-AD16) received October 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7728. A letter from the Deputy Director, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendments to Excepted Benefits [CMS-9946-F] (RIN: 0938-AS16) received September 29, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7729. A letter from the Under Secretary for Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report on export and reexport license requirements for integrated

circuits, seismic detection systems, helicopter landing system radars, and technology for infrared up-conversion devices; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7730. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-079, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7731. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-117, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7732. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a Memorandum of Justification for a drawdown under section 506(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to provide immediate military assistance to the Government of Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7733. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a letter regarding commitments in the Joint Plan of Action; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7734. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on employment of U.S. citizens by certain international organizations during 2013, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276c-4; Public Law 102-138, section 181; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7735. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergency Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7736. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting a formal response to the GAO report "Combating Terrorism: U.S. Efforts in Northwest Africa Would Be Strengthened by Enhanced Program Management"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7737. A letter from the Administrator, TSA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Administration's certification that the level of screening services and protection provided at Orlando Sanford International Airport (SFB) will be equal to or greater than the level that would be provided at the airport by TSA Transportation Security Officers; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

7738. A letter from the Chairman, National Health Care Workforce Commission, transmitting a letter regarding the National Health Care Workforce Commission; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5441. A bill to amend the Federal charter of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States to reflect the service of women in the Armed Forces of the United States (Rept. 113-620). Referred to the Com-

mittee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4049. A bill to amend the Act to provide for the establishment of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes, to adjust the boundary of that National Lakeshore to include the lighthouse known as Ashland Harbor Breakwater Light, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-621, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 5069. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act to increase in the price of Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamps to fund the acquisition of conservation easements for migratory birds, and for other purposes, with an amendment (Rept. 113-622). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 5040. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to Idaho County in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-623). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 5162. A bill to amend the Act entitled "An Act to allow a certain parcel of land in Rockingham County, Virginia, to be used for a child care center" to remove the use restriction, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-624). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3608. A bill to amend the Act of October 19, 1973, concerning taxable income to members of the Grand Portage Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians (Rept. 113-625, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BURGESS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 756. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1422) to amend the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1978 to provide for Scientific Advisory Board member qualifications, public participation, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4012) to prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency from proposing, finalizing, or disseminating regulations or assessments based upon science that is not transparent or reproducible; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4795) to promote new manufacturing in the United States by providing for greater transparency and timeliness in obtaining necessary permits, and for other purposes; and providing for proceedings during the period from November 21, 2014, through November 28, 2014 (Rept. 113-626). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII the Committees on Ways and Means and the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 3608 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure discharged from further consideration. H.R. 4049 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following

titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 5721. A bill to amend the Defense Base Act (42 U.S.C. 1651 et seq.) to require death benefits to be paid to a deceased employee's designated beneficiary or next of kin in the case of death resulting from a war-risk hazard or act of terrorism occurring on or after September 11, 2001; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BENISHEK (for himself and Mr. PETERS of Michigan):

H.R. 5722. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to review the decisions of the North American Electric Reliability Corporation affecting cost allocation under system support resources agreements; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 5723. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to extend the application of the Medicare payment rate floor to primary care services furnished under Medicaid and to apply the rate floor to additional providers of primary care services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 5724. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide funding for the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 5725. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the individual health insurance mandate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 5726. A bill to allow for energy exploration in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama (for himself, Mr. CULBERSON, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK):

H. Res. 757. A resolution providing for authority to initiate litigation for actions by the President or other executive branch officials inconsistent with their duties under the Constitution of the United States with respect to the implementation of the immigration laws; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 5721.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. BENISHEK:

H.R. 5722.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 3, giving Congress the Power "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;"

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 5723.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 5724.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 5725.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution, which reads, "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 5726.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2.

"The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State."

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 140: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 630: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 676: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 1015: Mr. FARR and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 1074: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky and Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 1094: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 1274: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1507: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1652: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 1666: Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 1812: Mr. DENHAM.

H.R. 1852: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 1981: Mr. TONKO and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 2116: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 2366: Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 2384: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 2529: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 2778: Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 2785: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 2901: Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 2918: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 3050: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 3118: Ms. HAHN, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 3133: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 3398: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 3485: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 3717: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 3747: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 3836: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 3877: Mr. KIND and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 3930: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 4226: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 4333: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 4351: Mr. NADLER, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. RUNYAN.

H.R. 4427: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 4594: Mr. LABRADOR.

H.R. 4612: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 4727: Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 4872: Mr. RIBBLE and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 4901: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 4920: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 4963: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 5012: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 5082: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DENT, and Mr. GRIMM.

H.R. 5226: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee and Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 5241: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 5267: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 5343: Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 5441: Ms. SINEMA and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 5484: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mrs. ROBY.

H.R. 5644: Mr. TONKO, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. ROONEY.

H.R. 5656: Mr. CRENSHAW and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 5662: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 5686: Mr. FARENTHOLD and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H. Res. 281: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. KIND, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. HANNA, Mr. MICA, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. PETRI, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. COFFMAN.

H. Res. 536: Mr. NOLAN.

H. Res. 716: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H. Res. 728: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MULVANEY, Ms. HAHN, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, and Ms. CHU.

H. Res. 730: Mr. HOLT.

H. Res. 735: Mr. ROSS.

H. Res. 755: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HANNA, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. VARGAS.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative MCNERNEY, or a designee, to H.R. 4795, the Promoting New Manufacturing Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.